

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 245 686

IR 050 758

AUTHOR Cherns, Jack J.
 TITLE Availability and Use of Official Publications in Libraries.
 INSTITUTION United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, Paris (France). General Information Programme.
 REPORT NO PGI-83/WS/30
 PUB DATE Nov 83
 NOTE 200p.
 PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
 EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
 DESCRIPTORS *Depository Libraries; Developing Nations; Global Approach; *Government Publications; International Organizations; Library Acquisition; *Library Collections; Library Research; *Library Surveys; Questionnaires; Use Studies

ABSTRACT

This study, which was carried out with the support of the International Federation of Library Associations (IFLA) and Unesco between February 1981 and June 1982, is believed to be the first of its kind in the field of official publications collections. The report is based on a detailed analysis of the 199 replies received to 563 questionnaires distributed worldwide to various types of libraries, e.g., parliamentary, public, university, administrative, and national libraries. Developing countries are well represented by number in the analyses, and less well, but adequately, in the volume of replies. The results indicate that official publications collections tend to be concentrated in national, academic, and institutional libraries. The conclusions suggest ways in which availability and use of official publications collections might be improved, above all by action to make deposit arrangements more coherent and effective on an international scale. Analyses of the overall data are appended, as well as breakdowns by geographical area and type of library. (DMC)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

* This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

ED245686

AVAILABILITY AND USE
OF OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS IN LIBRARIES

prepared by
Jack J. Cherns

General Information Programme and UNISIST

United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization

Reproduced by permission of
UNESCO

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. Coudert-Schklowski

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

LR050758

This document is the photographic reproduction of the
author's text.

Recommended catalogue entry:

Cherns, Jack J.

Availability and use of official publications in libraries / prepared by
Jack J. Cherns / for the / General Information Programme and UNISIST . -
Paris : Unesco, 1983 . - v, 140 p.; 30 cm . - (PGI-83/WS.30)

- I - Availability and use of official publications in libraries
- II - Unesco. General Information Programme and UNISIST

© Unesco 1983

PREFACE

The Programme for the Universal Availability of Publications (UAP) was launched by the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions in 1974 and Unesco cooperated with this endeavour almost from the start. The Organization sponsored various studies and research works, organized the International Congress on UAP, held in May 1982, and is now contributing to the follow-up of the recommendations of the Congress.

The present research was undertaken in this framework and, as its title indicates, is devoted to the availability and use of official publications. That this category of publications needs special attention is obvious to all - government officials, booksellers, librarians and users - who have to deal with those documents whether in their work or for private use: they differ by the way they are produced, acquired, processed, stored and used. Their availability and use through libraries is thus of special concern to the UAP Programme, for which user satisfaction is the ultimate goal for all types of publications.

Conducted through a questionnaire distributed worldwide, the study has produced a wealth of hard data allowing comparisons by regions and types of libraries. As the first study of this kind, it could not pretend to give a very detailed picture on all the factors involved. It helps nevertheless to understand how official publications are used and the difficulties they face before reaching the final user. From this point of view, the results will be also useful to those in charge of producing and distributing such publications.

The ideas and opinions expressed in this document are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the views of Unesco.

The designations employed and the presentation of material throughout the publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of Unesco concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning its frontiers or boundaries.

Suggestions, evaluative comments and requests for further information are welcome and should be addressed to the Division of the General Information Programme, Unesco, 7 Place de Fontenoy, 75000 Paris, France.

November, 1983

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PARAGRAPHS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	
SUMMARY NOTE	
I. INTRODUCTION	1-5
II. METHODOLOGY	6-13
III. RESPONSE	14-19
IV. ANALYSIS OF REPLIES	
A - Acquisition and collection	20-39
B - Volume of intake	40-42
C - Availability	43-47
D - Interlending	48
E - Arrangement and cataloguing	49-58
F - Amount & types of use and users	59-60
G - Official publishing by local (including municipal) authorities	61
H - Intergovernmental publications	62-64
V. DEVELOPING COUNTRIES	65-68
VI. CONCLUSIONS	69 (i-xv)

List of Tables

- Table 1. - Response rates by geographical areas.
- Table 2. - Response rates by type of library.
- Table 3. - Age and collection characteristics of libraries.
- Table 4. - Distribution of collection gaps.
- Table 5. - Percentages of libraries collecting comprehensively and exhaustively.
- Table 6. - Collecting objectives: success rates.
- Table 7. - Methods of acquisition (with Appendix A).
- Table 8. - Libraries receiving full or selective deposit by law or administrative instruction.
- Table 9. - Libraries using purchase as sole means of acquisition.
- Table 10.- Libraries collecting unpublished official material.
- Table 11.- Libraries with official documents librarians.
- Table 12.- Arrangement of official publications collections.
- Table 13.- Cross-question analysis. Cataloguing and handling of official publications collections.
- Table 14.- Cross-question analysis. Collecting levels and other characteristics of libraries.
- Table 15.- Cross-question analysis. Lending and accessibility.
- Table 16.- Distribution of questionnaire to developing countries.

List of Appendices

- Appendix A. - English-language version of questionnaire completed with statistical analysis of replies to each question.
- Appendix B. - Analysis of replies to questions - by geographical area.
- Appendix C. - Analysis of replies to questions - by type of library.
- Appendix D. - Distribution of questionnaire and response.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This project is believed to be the first of its kind in the field of official publications collections. It owes its existence to Eve Johansson, in her capacity as Secretary of the Official Publications Section of IFLA when she planned it in 1978 in relation to the IFLA UAP programme, to the subsequent support of IFLA Headquarters, and to the generosity of Unesco, who made it financially possible.

It would not have been possible, however, to carry it through and to bring it to a conclusion without the constant support, much hard work and ingenuity of Eve Johansson herself and the extensive practical backing and services provided by the Official Publications Library of the British Library.

To all these thanks are due. And not least to those many librarians whose replies and interest have contributed the essential material for the study.

J.J. Cherns
October 1982

SUMMARY

- i. The study was undertaken with the support of IFLA and Unesco, and was carried out between February 1981 and June 1982. This report is based on detailed analysis of 199 replies received. Six more arrived too late for inclusion, but would not affect the results. 565 questionnaires were distributed, 121 of them to countries from which no response was received. Developing countries are well represented by number in the analyses, less well but adequately in the volume of replies.
- ii. Libraries' collection policies in all areas are ambitious; 74% of respondents aim to collect comprehensively or exhaustively. Deposit is by far the most common means of collecting, enjoyed to some degree by 76% of respondents, most of them national, parliamentary or academic libraries. 52% rely on deposit for 75% or more of their official publications intake, and another 14% for 50-74%. Public libraries are the least well served by deposit among types of libraries, South America and the Caribbean least among geographical areas. There is a general shortfall in attainment; only 13% report that they achieve their main objectives. The main reasons are deficiencies in definition of deposit responsibilities, absence of timely bibliographic records and defects in compliance. 37% of respondent libraries report significant gaps in continuity of period, subject and sources. Official publications collections are therefore a good deal less than complete, within whatever objectives they set.
- iii. Most libraries use donations and purchase to supplement deposits. Only 9% of libraries use purchase as a sole means of acquisition, mainly university and public libraries in Europe.
- iv. Official publications collections tend to be concentrated in national, academic and institutional libraries. These may not be natural libraries of first resort for many, especially occasional users and the general reader, and consideration needs giving to the position of public libraries in the availability of official publications. But existing collections are reasonably accessible to users: 61% are freely accessible to the general public, and 74% lend in some way. Guidance to users is generally indifferent; as many as 45% of respondents take no special measures to make their official publications collections known, and only 31% provide a printed guide about the arrangement and content of this notoriously difficult material. 42% of libraries have an official documents librarian,

most frequently to be found in North America, Australasia and Africa. Policies for the arrangement and treatment of official publications are very mixed. Full cataloguing and integration, complete or near - complete, in libraries' main stocks represent the most common pattern, particularly in the older - established libraries of Europe. Only 23% of respondents maintain a completely separate stock, and these are predominantly in North America and Africa. 42% of respondents have wholly integrated collections - mainly national, state and parliamentary libraries. Cataloguing practices are also very varied, and many idiosyncratic systems and modifications are in use, indicating the difficulty of dealing with this material on any standard basis. Only 33% of respondents have a separate official publications catalogue. Only 9% do not include official publications in their main catalogues. Up to 60% catalogue them comprehensively by subject, title or issuing source (the most frequently used reference). There is substantial use of published lists and catalogues as finding aids, with annotations. Cross-referencing, however, tends to be within the main catalogue only, and not to other sources. 68% of libraries are satisfied with their cataloguing and referencing, but 21% have plans for improvement.

- v. Recording of use and users is not systematic, and 57% of libraries keep no records at all, though subjective knowledge of use is often extensive. Government officials are surprisingly frequent users of official publications collections. Statistics are the most heavily-used type of official material; periodicals and monographs are less used than their originating sources may think. Some systematic surveying of use could provide valuable feedback on the utility of types of official material.
- vi. Local and municipal publications and publications of intergovernmental bodies are widely collected, and many difficulties are reported.
- vii. Appendices to the Report analyse the data totally and by geographical area and type of library. It is clear that South America is poorly served in many ways for official publications collections, that among developing areas Africa seems to have the best foundation of library practice and organisation, and that services in public libraries generally for official publications are behind those elsewhere. Some cross-question analyses suggest correlations between aspects of library policy such as the presence of an official documents librarian, the arrangement of collections, and cataloguing and guidance practices,

which may have important implications for making collections as accessible as possible.

- viii. The conclusions suggest ways in which availability and use of official publications collections might be improved, above all by action to make deposit arrangements more coherent and effective, on an international scale. Better guidance and current availability are needed in libraries, which are generally far from immediate sources of reference. But policy decisions at government level, possibly linked to the theme of better public information, will be the most necessary improvement in the present costly arrangements which fall short of real effectiveness, and could better support the unique rôle and key potential of libraries.

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Official publications record and convey the many types of information which modern governments collect in the course of their functions. They are often monopolists of it. Official publications are also a means of public expression and propagation of the policies and activities of governments. The media, in all forms, are the channel for conveyance of the news-value of those official outputs, which play a large part in setting the agenda of public discussion. This is, however, selective and opinionated conveyance, within the much-studied and characteristic functions of the media in selection and discussion of "newsworthy" material. For the full study of the information content, and for formation of public views and study of government policies, nothing can replace the facility for individuals to have access to the complete, authentic texts of official publications. This requires organised distribution and facilities, in which libraries are a traditional and major agency.
2. The bases and methods of collecting official publications, the techniques of dealing with them in libraries, and the widely recognised deficiencies in their bibliographic control have received much discussion within the library profession. Little is known, however, in any detail, about the value of libraries as an information interface between government and public, and the effectiveness with which libraries of all kinds collect and make accessible to their users the official publications of their own countries. This rôle of the library is important everywhere, and particularly important in developing countries, with limited educational structures and government machinery of very variable quality.

But this is a field in which there is very little factual information of a systematic kind. It is well-known to professionals that the difficulties of identifying and acquiring official publications (due primarily to decentralisation of official publishing and poor bibliographic control) make comprehensive collecting in most countries impossible to achieve. Use of official publications by the general public, the researcher, and others is thought by the library profession to be low, and it is felt that the published output of governments in most countries of the world is one of the most intractable and inaccessible bodies of material known. Libraries' treatment of their collections and the difficulties inherent in using official publica-

tions may be relevant: but there has been very little research on these questions.

The issues are central to the theme of Universal Availability of Publications, which underlies the present medium-term programme of IFLA.

3. At the meeting of the International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions (IFLA) at Strebske Pleso in Czechoslovakia in August 1978 the Official Publications Section formulated a project to investigate the availability and use of official publications in libraries, around three questions:
 - a) how good and complete are the collections of the official publications of their own countries' governments in various libraries of the country (e.g. parliamentary, national, etc.)?
 - b) how accessible are they to different kinds of public within the country or jurisdiction of origin ?
 - c) what use do they receive, and by what kinds of public ?
4. This project was subsequently adopted by the Professional Board of IFLA, and funds for it were made available by Unesco in two stages:
 - a) to collect information by means of a questionnaire;
 - b) to analyse and interpret the data obtained, with the specific aims of:
 - i. emphasising aspects of availability and use;
 - ii. providing a picture of the situation, so that governments can improve their information and publishing policies;
 - iii. making specific proposals for improvement.
5. After preparatory work with the help of a Steering Committee, consisting of Mr. M.B. Line of the IFLA UAP Office, Mme. S. Honoré, formerly of the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, and for some years Chairman of the Official Publications Section, and Ms. Eve Johansson, then Secretary of the Official Publications Section, field-work for the project began in early 1981. This report sets out the methodology adopted and the results obtained, analyses and interprets the data, and sets out conclusions

and proposals.

II. METHODOLOGY

6. The basic field of the enquiry was to be about 400 libraries of various types (e.g. parliamentary, public, university, administrative, national) in some 50 countries around the world, with an appropriate geographical balance. The study was to cover collecting policies, difficulties in acquiring, handling and making available official publications, and the use that they receive in libraries. The full panoply of research methodology of existing documentation and collection of it where deficient; a pilot study, supplemented by visits and discussions to help determine the form of the major study; follow-up procedures and visits to supplement this on the basis of structured interviews - would have called for time and resources in both personnel and finance far beyond those available to cover a field of such geographical spread and functional variety. Interview alone, even on a pilot basis, would tend to produce selective results unreliable for extrapolation, given all the special interests of libraries. Questions and answers would be best dealt with at arm's length, and on a common basis as far as possible, in order to produce a representative foundation of factual information. The best way to obtain this was to ask for it in the terms in which it was required. For these reasons a questionnaire was considered the most effective main instrument.

The Questionnaire

7. In drawing up a questionnaire the basic considerations and objectives were:
 - a) it was important to obtain factual replies on common bases. The questionnaire was therefore framed as far as practicable to require precise and numerical replies and evaluations. Respondents were invited to supplement the factual framework with comment and documentation, as a questionnaire could not cover all the variety of circumstance;
 - b) for purposes of the study the questionnaire defined such terms as "official publications" and "official source" which may be understood differently since they derive in each country from its patterns of government and administration, and also some terms of measurement;

- c) to avoid undue weighting towards major libraries in more developed countries which are known to have important collections. The survey covered many libraries in less developed areas and the selection of libraries was aimed to be representative and to include libraries other than those with the main collections. In assessing the general picture negative results, and their scale, would have an importance. This accepted the risk that the response might be incomplete;
 - d) questionnaires were related to "jurisdiction" in order to cover the problem of federal and similar constitutional structure;
 - e) the questionnaire was issued in English, French, Spanish and Russian, in order to give the most effective choice to respondents on the international scale involved within reasonable limits of expense;
 - f) advice and assistance was enlisted from known "experts" on official publications in particular countries, and from library members of IFLA, listed by the Official Publications Section and in the IFLA Handbook.
8. Funds and time precluded any extensive pilot scheme, but a draft questionnaire was sent during 1980 to 16 libraries in 12 countries, to test their response and views. The 14 replies received made useful and constructive suggestions, mainly of detail and wording, which were adopted where practicable; but they generally validated the substance of the questionnaire.
9. At Unesco's suggestion a short list of questions about the publications of intergovernmental agencies was added. Though not germane to the project it would be useful as a preparatory basis for possible further study.
10. The final questionnaire was distributed by air mail in February/March 1981. The English-language version is at Appendix A, and for ease of reference, displays the statistical analysis of replies to each question. A covering note of guidance and explanation, and an appendix of definitions were incorporated in the document. A numerical/language summary of the distribution, completed with details of response, is at Appendix D.

In the expectation that response from some areas might be poor the initial distribution was on a wider scale than strictly required by the terms of reference.

11. A questionnaire containing 43 detailed questions is at first sight a formidable proposition to tackle. However, relatively few librarians would be concerned with the whole (many would not be involved with sections such as deposit/gifts/purchases/interlending/multilingual publishing/intergovernmental organisations) and, though questions are detailed, there are few which knowledgeable and experienced librarians should not be able to answer fairly readily. In the event the length and detail of the questionnaire did not seem to worry respondents significantly.

Follow-up

12. Follow-up action was on a flexible basis, in the first place through identified "experts" or through librarians of national library institutions, who could be expected to have suitable contacts and influence within their countries. This resulted in some minor extensions of the initial distribution.

In December 1981 wider follow-up action was taken:

- a) by sending further "group" hasteners through experts;
- b) by sending out a further 60 questionnaires to libraries in countries held on a reserve list;
- c) by sending a reminder postcard to individual non-respondents not covered on any group basis.

Analysis of Completed Questionnaires

13. Analysis of a questionnaire of this type could be done effectively only by computer. Computer support initially promised by the UAP Office could not eventually be given, because of timing and other commitments, and other computer capacity was procured with the help of further financial support from Unesco, though the project was delayed. There are three main statistical analyses:
 - a) a consolidated count of all valid replies to all questions, shown on the English-language questionnaire at Appendix A;

- b) an analysis of replies to each question by geographical area of response, at Appendix B;
- c) an analysis of replies to each question by type of library, at Appendix C.

A supplementary cross - analysis of related questions was done. This is referred to in the text of the report, as appropriate, and some associations are summarised in tables, though the full range of the analysis is not susceptible to statistical display.

FOOTNOTE

All percentages mentioned in the text are expressed in relation to the total number of responses (199) analysed in Appendix A. However where a geographical area or a type of library is being discussed, they will be expressed as percentages of the number of libraries of a particular type or of libraries in a given area (e.g. n % national libraries).

III. RESPONSE

14. Response by country is indicated on Appendix D, and was patchy. Postal delays and losses were widespread, and slowed the progress of the project. Such difficulties are no doubt inherent in any postal survey on a world-wide scale. It may be also that copies delivered to addressees unspecified by name or title in reference books did not filter through to those in the organisation of particular libraries concerned with official publications. Second copies sent on request did not seem to go astray. Some librarians were good enough to write and explain that their collections are not within the scope of the project.
15. The quality of the replies was variable. Some were meticulous, and had been completed with interest and care. Some however were inconsistent, or left uncompleted questions or parts of questions which could apparently have been answered. This accounts for statistical discrepancies in numbers of replies which will be noticed in Appendix A.
16. Though the statistical analysis on which this report is based is, therefore, to be treated with some reserve in these respects, it does, nevertheless, indicate some very definite patterns. These were established at an early stage, and further completed questionnaires tended to elaborate and reinforce, rather than to alter them. Supplementary comment in the replies gave valuable depth to the analysis, and has been summarised as appropriate in relation to particular questions or sections in the questionnaire.
17. The project was closed in June 1982, when it was clear that no further significant number of replies was to be expected. The total number of replies received was 205 - 51% of the objective of 400 libraries, and an overall response rate of 37%.

Six replies were too late for inclusion in the computer analysis. This report is therefore based on the 199 replies analysed in Appendix A. (It is clear from comparison of these figures with preliminary analyses of 143 completed questionnaires, which were the basis of an interim report submitted to Unesco in April 1982, that the six replies not included in the final analysis would make no significant difference to the results.)

Appendix B omits 4 replies from the Middle East, and is therefore based on 195 replies. Appendix C similarly omits 6 replies from scientific/technical libraries, and is based on 193 replies. The response in both

cases was considered too small to support statistical conclusions. These omissions cause some minor statistical discrepancies between the Appendices, and in some Tables.

18. The objective of about 50 countries was fully achieved: completed questionnaires were received from 56 countries. The geographical spread, including many developing countries, is very wide. One area, however (the Middle East) was represented by only 4 replies, of which 3 were from one country.

TABLE 1. RESPONSE RATES BY GEOGRAPHICAL AREAS

Area *	Distribution of questionnaire		Response Rate	
	All Countries	Countries from which no reply received	All Countries	excluding countries from which no reply received
Europe	190	38	41%	52%
N. America	57	-	72%	72%
S. America & Caribbean	80	14	25%	30%
Africa	93	26	27%	37%
Middle East	38	24	11%	28%
Australasia/Oceania	30	-	77%	77%
Asia & Far East	77	19	22%	29%
	565	121	37%	47%

Note (1) Response rate in relation to the objective of 400 libraries was 51%

(11) Some libraries received more than one questionnaire.

19. The high response rates from North America and Australasia are notable, but the actual numbers of libraries involved do not overweight the project generally, even bearing in mind the high level of library collecting of official publications. The extensive distribution of questionnaires to Europe covered 19 countries, of which 3 returned no replies.

* These areas which are used throughout this report are strictly geographical and do not correspond to the definition of regions with a view to the execution by the Organization of Regional Activities (see Manual of the General Conference. Paris: Unesco, 1981.)

TABLE 2. RESPONSE RATES BY TYPE OF LIBRARY

Type of library	No. of questionnaires	Response
National	96	48%
State	34	56%
Parliamentary	50	44%
Administrative	74	36%
University/ academic	188	30%
Public	113	25%
Scientific/ technical	10	60%
TOTAL	565	37%

Note: Some libraries received more than one questionnaire.

IV. ANALYSIS OF REPLIES

SECTION A. ACQUISITION AND COLLECTION

20. The age, continuity and characteristics of collection building are factors basic to library resources of official publications which are available. The replies to Question 1 and their detailed analyses are summarised at Table 3 to give a composite picture by area and type. It is clear that the survey draws on solid and worldwide experience of well-established collections. 74% of respondents had been collecting for more than 20 years, and 92% had a history of continuous acquisition in this field. Less developed areas naturally show the shorter collecting histories.

TABLE 3. AGE AND COLLECTING CHARACTERISTICS OF LIBRARIES

G E O G R A P H I C A L A R E A								
	TOTAL	Europe (78)	North America (27)	Latin America + Caribbean (18)	Africa (24)	Austral- asia/ Oceania (23)	Asia (16)	
	No. %	No. %	No. %	No. %	No. %	No. %	No. %	
<u>Age of collection</u>								
Less than 10 years	15 8	4 5	1 3	3 17	4 17	- -	3 19	
11-20 years	34 17	5 6	5 14	4 22	9 38	7 30	2 13	
More than 20 yrs.	147 74	68 87	30 81	10 56	11 46	16 70	11 69	
<u>Continuous Acquisition</u>	183 92	72 92	34 91	17 94	21 88	22 96	15 94	
<u>Significant Gaps in Continuity</u>								
Subject	34 17	15 19	4 11	4 22	5 21	4 17	2 13	
period	65 33	26 33	7 19	12 67	9 38	3 13	5 31	
sources	47 24	17 21	8 22	5 28	7 29	4 17	4 25	
<u>Causes of Gaps in Continuity</u>								
Acquisition policy	38 19	18 23	6 16	6 33	3 13	4 17	1 6	
basis of deposit	22 11	7 9	5 14	2 11	2 8	4 17	2 13	
weeding	10 5	6 8	1 3	2 11	- -	- -	1 6	
loss or destruc- tion	32 16	13 17	1 3	4 22	8 33	1 4	4 25	

	TYPE OF LIBRARY													
	TOTAL		National (46)		State (19)		Parliamentary (22)		Administrative (27)		University (57)		Public (28)	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
<u>Age of collection</u>														
Less than 10 yrs	15	8	4	9	1	5	-	-	2	7	4	7	4	14
11-20 years	34	17	9	20	1	5	-	-	5	19	15	26	3	11
More than 20 yrs	147	74	32	70	16	84	22	100	18	67	37	65	21	75
<u>Continuous Acquisition</u>	183	92	46	100	17	89	22	100	21	78	51	89	24	86
<u>Significant Gaps in Continuity</u>	73	37	19	41	4	21	6	27	6	22	22	39	14	50
subject	34	17	5	11	1	5	6	27	3	11	9	16	8	29
period	65	33	15	33	4	21	3	14	6	22	21	37	14	50
sources	47	24	13	28	6	32	2	9	5	19	10	18	9	32
<u>Causes of Gaps in Continuity</u>														
acquisition policy	38	19	3	6	-	-	2	9	3	11	18	32	10	36
basis of deposit	22	11	5	11	3	16	2	9	2	7	6	11	4	14
weeding	10	5	1	2	-	-	2	9	3	11	1	2	3	11
loss or destruction	32	16	8	17	4	21	3	14	3	11	9	16	5	18
<u>Note</u>	Excludes scientific/technical libraries													

However no less than 37% of respondents reported significant gaps in subject, period or source continuity, or a combination of such gaps. Changes in acquisition policy and/or basis of deposit are common causes. This represents a substantial margin of variability in the range and coherence of collections which is susceptible to control, by libraries or depositing authorities, in the interests of avoiding significant gaps. Among particular reasons given in comment on the occurrence of such gaps are:

- a) failure to maintain consistent collecting policies in the early stages of library development - a factor likely to apply particularly to developing countries;
- b) the effect of financial constraints, including high prices, hindering both acquisition and replacement - in heavily used collections copies of publications can quickly become spoilt;
- c) administrative failures and uncertainties on the part of issuing authorities, in a variety of forms such as failure to comply with deposit laws and instructions, inconsistency in publishing and distribution, rapid exhaustion of prints.

21. In general, the stability of official publications collections seems reasonably satisfactory, but the replies indicate a surprising number and range of significant gaps which must weaken the effectiveness of many libraries in ways which may not be immediately apparent to the user. Table 4. shows that all types of libraries in all areas have gaps in their collections attributable to more than one cause, and that national, university and public libraries are as prone to these deficiencies as others.

TABLE 4. DISTRIBUTION OF COLLECTION GAPS

Libraries reporting gaps	Total count of gaps	Distribution of gaps (all causes)					
		Type of Library			Geographical area		
			<u>Gaps</u>	<u>Libraries</u>		<u>Gaps</u>	<u>Libraries</u>
73	146	National	33	19	Europe	58	31
		State	11	4	N. America	19	6
		Parliamentary	11	6	S. America +	21	12
		Administrative	14	6	Caribbean		
		University/academic	40	22	Africa	21	10
					Australasia	11	7
		Public	31	14	Asia	11	5

Levels of Collecting and their Attainment

22. Levels and objectives are the essential framework of collections. They complement the background of history and continuity with a measure of the general adequacy of the library system to meet user needs. Failure to meet objectives in attaining the desired level of collecting must be a comment on the effectiveness of the system. Collecting levels are ambitious; 74% of respondent libraries attempt to collect comprehensively or exhaustively:

TABLE 5. PERCENTAGES OF LIBRARIES COLLECTING COMPREHENSIVELY AND EXHAUSTIVELY

Type of Library	Compre- hensive	Exhaus- tive	Total	Geographical Area	Compre- hensive	Exhaus- tive	Total
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
National	35	61	96	Europe	38	38	76
State	26	58	84	N. America	41	46	87
Parliamentary	41	50	91	S. America	44	39	83
Administrative	15	7	22	Africa	21	62	83
University	42	28	70	Australasia	43	39	82
Public	43	29	72	Asia	19	31	50

In less developed areas there may be an inclination to collect comprehensively or exhaustively where the numbers of official publications are not large, Public libraries aim surprisingly high. But the measure of success in all cases is important.

23. The replies to Question 3. show unmistakeably two characteristics of collecting objectives and their attainment:

- a) the collecting objectives for what may broadly be called the publications of the "fringe" bodies of government (category iv) are set a clear step below those for publications of the clear and regular governmental departments. This is generally substantiated for all areas and all types of libraries in the detailed analyses in Appendices B and C. Only libraries in Africa have roughly the same collecting objectives for both.
- b) for both categories attainment falls substantially below the objectives, and is worse for

* For definition of these terms, see appendix to questionnaire.

"fringe" bodies than for others. Thus:

TABLE 6. COLLECTING OBJECTIVES: SUCCESS RATES

Category	Libraries with objective to collect all publications	Libraries reporting success	Libraries succeeding in collecting only 75% & less of their objectives
<u>All libraries</u>			
i - iii	45 %	13 %	34 %
iv	30 %	7 %	43 %
<u>National libraries</u>			
i - iii	72 %	17 %	31 %
iv	61 %	13 %	28 %

National libraries, which might be expected to have the most comprehensive collecting objectives and achievements in both fields, fall a good deal short of totality, in both objectives and success rates.

24. The replies to Questions 1-3 emphasise the general difficulties of collecting official publications. They make it clear that official publications collections presented to users are likely on the whole to be, even within the limitations of collecting objectives, significantly incomplete. This result stems no doubt partly from the well-known difficulties of defining the field of collection, but certainly, according to the replies, from substantial failure in practical terms to attain collecting objectives, whatever they may be. This failure must be examined in relation to methods of collecting.

Methods of Collection - Deposit

25. Deposit, by law, administrative instruction or custom, with or without a concomitant commitment to public access such as exists in the U.S.A., emerges as the prime means of collecting official publications. As many as 66% of respondents report full or selective deposit rights by law or administrative instruction. Table 7, summarising the replies to Question 20.1., illustrates the dominance of deposit for the major part of collections and the relatively small proportions of official publications acquired by gift and purchase.

TABLE 7.

METHODS OF ACQUISITION

Method	Proportion of collection obtained							
	0 - 24%		25 - 49%		50 - 74%		75 - 100%	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Deposit	3	2	6	3	28	14	105	53
Gift	107	54	21	11	10	5	23	12
Purchase	96	48	12	6	11	6	27	14

26. Variations between areas and types of library still leave the proportions of libraries with deposit generally high:

TABLE 8. LIBRARIES RECEIVING FULL OR SELECTIVE DEPOSIT BY LAW OR ADMINISTRATIVE INSTRUCTION

	GEOGRAPHICAL AREA					
	Europe	North America	South America + Caribbean	Africa	Australasia / Oceania	Asia
Full or selective deposit by law	46%	38%	28%	58%	17%	31%
Full or selective deposit by administrative instruction	17%	39%	-	25%	52%	19%
	TYPE OF LIBRARY					
	National	State	Parliamentary	Administrative	University/Academic	Public
Full or selective deposit by law	74%	42%	32%	11%	30%	29%
Full or selective deposit by administrative instruction	11%	26%	36%	41%	33%	18%

Some libraries receive deposit on both bases, depending on the source. There may be some overlap in the deposit figures received; but the count from completed questionnaires shows 152 libraries to be receiving deposit of some sort - often under more than one heading in Question 4.1. Of those

which indicated deposit by legal right, the cross-question analysis shows 65 (68%) did not enjoy deposit on any other basis.

27. South America and the Caribbean area emerges as very poorly served by legal and administrative deposit; otherwise Asia and the Far East is an area perceptibly less well served than others. Libraries in Africa are on the best footing-even higher than in North America, though the range of official publishing is far less and the difficulties of collection greater. Among types of libraries public libraries fare comparatively badly.
28. The replies to Question 7 suggest that deposit is on the whole an unselective method of collection, only 20% of libraries accepting deposits for selective general or subject coverage. Only 16% forgo any deposit rights because of their collecting levels.

Cross-question analysis establishes a strong correlation between comprehensive collecting and the enjoyment of deposit (though deposit is used to a lesser, but nevertheless substantial, degree by libraries with less ambitious collecting objectives.) Thus, of those libraries which aim to collect comprehensively, 88% have deposit arrangements; 51% of the 152 libraries that have deposit are aiming to collect comprehensively. But the majority of those whose objective it is to collect comprehensively also supplement deposit by purchase (63%) and gift (80%).

29. The prevalence of deposit as a method of acquisition is, however, no guarantee of effectiveness. The replies to Question 22a and b indicate the range of difficulties encountered in operation, the most frequently reported being **failure** or weakness of the depositing authorities, while other difficulties arise from inadequate definitions. Difficulties of identification, and especially of tracing, are also noted - the latter by 59% of libraries. Comment suggests that in federal systems of government there is generally a lack of common basis between component jurisdictions in deposit of official publications, both within jurisdictions and in deposit of one jurisdiction's publications within other jurisdictions of the same country. This must inevitably make for uneven collection of official publications. The interests of users within a particular country are unlikely to be limited by the internal administrative or political boundaries.

30. Many librarians are able to cite the deposit laws or instructions on which their collections are based. But these texts are far from fully effective bases for deposit. Legislation of this kind lacks means of enforcement and, generally, co-ordinating machinery. Administrative instruction is discretionary rather than legal in effect. While deposit laws and instructions are normally a good deal more than declarations of intent, they fall short, on the whole, of laying down fully satisfactory bases of operation for libraries. This defect is easily compounded by defects in compliance because of lack of clarity in the obligations themselves and of simple administrative deficiencies in the machinery of distribution.
31. The outstanding characteristics of deposit in action emerge from the replies to Questions 5, 6 and 8. There is, first, the basic difficulty in coverage of the range of official sources as defined for purposes of the questionnaire. Only 45% of respondents report in Question 5 a coverage by law or instruction of over 80% of sources of publications, with another 19% reporting a 50% - 80% coverage. Translated into terms of respondents to this particular question the percentages would be higher, but they must have a bearing on the shortfall in attainment of objectives evident from Question 3 replies. An under 80% coverage must be considered as weak. National, state and parliamentary libraries show the best proportions. In geographical areas the figures for North America probably reflect differences in practice between Canada and the United States of America.
32. Question 6 attempts to discover how well defined are the essential terms. For a deposit system to be effective in operation it must be on a basis clearly understandable in practice to both depositor and recipient. The question was not evenly answered by the roughly 140 respondents to its various sections, but the numbers of respondents to each of them indicate the weakness in legislation and instruction. The terms denoting coverage or range are more frequently specified than the terms ("government", "official", "government departments") on which the practical operation of deposit systems must rest. In geographical terms North America and Australia come out fairly well. But a structural weakness must be caused by this unevenness in range of specification, and this is, in effect, summed up in Question 8, in conjunction with the effect of operating difficulties in compliance and identification. About 105 libraries answered parts of this question, and the numbers reporting total effectiveness are small. In systems resting on

law and administrative instruction anything under 80% effectiveness must surely be reckoned unsatisfactory, and less than 50% tantamount to failure. In those terms 27-37% of libraries with deposit are receiving unsatisfactory results from their deposit systems, including 9-11% for which these systems are virtually ineffective. The geographical analysis identifies a particular area of weakness, in South America and the Caribbean.

33. The replies to Question 10 suggest that some libraries may do little to help themselves, by acceptance virtually of whatever deposits happen to arrive, checking only against consignment lists, or simply not at all. But the principal weakness is likely to be the absence of bibliographic material against which consignments may be properly checked, as well as the absence of accompanying documentation.

Methods of Collecting - Gifts

34. While the acceptance of deposits is generally indiscriminate, if they are offered, libraries show a marked tendency to discrimination in relation to gifts both solicited and offered. As replies to Question 12 show 68% of respondents seek gifts from within their own jurisdictions, and 58% do so, in appropriate circumstances, from other jurisdictions within the country; but they do so predominantly on a selective basis. Acceptance of unsolicited gifts offered is similarly both widespread and selective. It seems likely, looking at these replies in conjunction with Table 7, that gifts are mainly a method of infilling collections.

Methods of Collecting - Purchase

35. Purchase is an inherently selective means of collecting, the expenditure of money imposing its own disciplines. The replies to Questions 13-16 emphasise the purpose as being mainly to supplement acquisition by other means - 66% of all respondents. Table 9 emphasises both the small number of libraries using purchase as the sole means of acquisition, 18 (9%), and their substantial concentration in Europe. In type, the libraries are mainly university and public. As many as 25% of public libraries rely totally on purchase.

But all purchasing libraries clearly use more than one means of tracing and make use of unpublished sources and "contacts" for their informa-

tion. Use of bibliographic material is relatively low in South America, Africa and Asia, no doubt for the reasons suggested in para.33 above. Libraries receive little financial help by way of price concession, considering their major role in the dissemination of official publications; most receive no special terms, and those which do rarely more than 10%. Many libraries, of course, receive other forms of financial assistance from government. Within the limitations, state and university libraries do reasonably well, and public libraries not badly. North America does better than other areas. But the figures do suggest that special terms might be more liberally given to libraries in the light of their rôle.

The spread of purchasing methods used, shown in replies to Question 16, reflects the well-known difficulties of purchasing official publications in many countries, from multiple points of origin and through poor distribution systems, which many libraries (28%) use commercial agents to mitigate or avoid.

TABLE 9. LIBRARIES USING PURCHASE AS SOLE MEANS OF ACQUISITION

GEOGRAPHICAL AREA			TYPE OF LIBRARY		
	Libraries reporting purchase as sole means of acquisition			Libraries reporting purchase as sole means of acquisition	
	No	%		No	%
Europe	14	18	National	1	2
N. America	1	2	State	-	-
S. America	-	-	Parliamentary	-	-
Africa	2	8	Administrative	3	11
Australasia	1	4	University	7	12
Asia	-	-	Public	7	25

Note: Only 14% of libraries (Table 7) use purchase as their main means of collection (i.e. for 75-100%).

Microform Acquisition

36. Considering the rapidly growing use of microform methods a surprisingly large proportion of respondent libraries - 47% - do not collect official

publications in this mode. North America (95%) and Australasia (78%) are outstanding in microform collection (they also have the highest incidence of official publishing in microform only). There is little microform collection in South America, Africa and Asia. State, parliamentary and university libraries are the highest users. Microforms are used mainly to fill gaps in collections (24%), to save shelf space (22%), and as additional copies of printed publications (19%).

The replies to Question 17b show the extent to which commercial publishers have entered this field, in which governments have been, on the whole, slow to start. But the proportions of official publications in microform within collections are still low, predominantly less than 5%. Reading equipment is available on the spot, and for the most part print-outs can be supplied on the spot - though a small number of libraries using microform have no print-out facilities. In all the arguments which go on about the use of microform methods the most important seems the need of the user, and few users will be satisfied with microforms from which they cannot obtain immediate copies. Comments with the replies reflect the technical and historical difficulties for libraries which have acquired during the development of the mode microform material with limited or no capacity for printout production.

Unpublished Items

37. No less than 53% of all respondents collect material which is not published in the normal way by the issuing official sources. It has a wide variety, but much is in the form of departmental reports, consultants' studies, evidence to committees, internal research reports and discussion papers, and so on. Table 10 shows the distribution analyses:

TABLE 10. LIBRARIES COLLECTING UNPUBLISHED OFFICIAL MATERIAL

TYPE OF LIBRARY		More than 5% of collection		GEOGRAPHICAL AREA		More than 5% of collection			
No	%			No	%				
National	22	48	9	20	Europe	36	46	11	14
State	13	68	1	5	N. America	28	76	3	8
Parliamentary	18	81	4	18	S. America / Caribbean	7	39	1	6
Administrative	11	41	3	11	Africa	17	71	6	25
University	31	54	7	12	Australasia / Oceania	12	52	2	9
Public	10	36	-	-	Asia & East Far	5	31	1	6

The proportions of libraries with such collections are particularly high in North America and Africa, and in state, parliamentary and university libraries. Collections constituting more than 5% of total collections seem particularly important in Africa. Both South America and Asia are poorly represented.

These are important collections for research purposes, and even public libraries have a significant representation. On the face of it more information needs collecting about this kind of material and the means and conditions of access to it, including restrictions.

Time-lags in Receipt of Publications

38. Speed is not a marked characteristic of the supply of official publications anywhere, and Question 19 provides a footnote on this aspect. The figures are a combination of minimum and maximum periods. It seems to take generally up to a month or so after publication to receive substantial quantities of either information about new publications or the publications themselves, and often longer, particularly for deposit publications received automatically, which one would expect to be quicker. Purchasing does not show up well. This does not complete the line of action until the publications are actually available to library users, who, it is clear, cannot regard libraries as an immediate resource of current official documentary information.

Acquisition Problems

39. Some comment on the replies to Question 22 is given at para.29 above in relation to deposit. This is one question on which librarians were free with supplementary comment, and the difficulties are by no means confined to deposit. The inadequacy and lateness of bibliographical records is widely criticised. There are, in fact, often no current bibliographical records available, and it may be a matter of months or, in some countries, years before they appear, rarely covering the complete field of official publishing, and inadequately indexed. This necessitates the commitment of much library time to keeping track, establishing reliable contacts, chasing publications which have exhausted their prints before they can be identified, trying to check consignments sent without lists, and so on. In deposit, difficulties of definition receive a due share of comment, but complaint of failure or weakness in deposit is directed most heavily

at the ~~the~~ indiscipline and inadequacies of official sources in complying with deposit laws and instructions, partly through ignorance, partly because of lack of co-operation. With all their known defects, deposit laws and instructions would be far more effective if properly observed. In purchase, libraries are more concerned about the limitation of their funds than about high prices of official publications (though the concerns must be to some degree complementary); and inadequate prints by the issuing source are clearly a general irritation and frequent cause of blemishes in collections.

SECTION B. - VOLUME OF INTAKE

40. This, and some following sections of the questionnaire, were designed to test the knowledge and concern of librarians about aspects of the physical management of their official publications collections, and about the influences at work on them. It was not expected that many would have the sort of figures requested in Question 23, partly because many official publications collections are not shelved separately (50%) or in readily measurable sequence (27%). Only 14% of respondents were able to give some factual measurements though a fair proportion were able to give some reasonable estimations. It is not practicable to display measurement figures in detail, and the great differences in output between countries would make such a display of no particular value.
41. Yet it is clear from the replies to Question 24 that the intake of official publications into respondent libraries is increasing, in 24% of them by more than 10% per annum, and that major causes of increase are the greater number of publications and issuing sources. There is also a significant improvement in library effectiveness in collection. It is in line with all that is known about the growth of executive government to find the replies (94%) identifying central government and its "fringe" bodies as the main growth points. The physical problems associated with the collection of official publications are likely to increase rather than decrease. It is notable that 75% of respondents do not weed their official publications collections at all (Question 31).
42. It is important from the point of view of users generally that official publications collections available to them should reflect adequately the balance of official publishing, otherwise there would be a tendency for them to have to go from one specialised collection to another to find what they want, or to be unaware of the degree of specialisation. Though a surprising number of respondents failed to give a comprehensible answer to question 25, the two figures shown (1 and 2) indicate whether the order of the numbers in the boxes corresponded (1) or otherwise (2). There is enough to suggest that collections are not on the whole over-specialised and unbalanced.

SECTION C. - AVAILABILITY

43. Official publications collections tend to be concentrated in national, academic and institutional libraries. A high proportion (61%) are

freely accessible to the general public, often, where relevant, under the terms of deposit. A further 22% are accessible to members of the public who can show a special interest, and refusal of reasonable access would be uncharacteristic of the library profession. However, many of the libraries in which collections are kept may not be a natural first resort for many users, especially casual users. North America has the least inhibited access to the general public; libraries in Europe are the least liberal in this respect. However, as many as 73% of collecting libraries lend in some way. Some types of libraries are not, of course, lending libraries, except of last resort, and then to other libraries.

44. Considering the growth and complexity of the field the presence in a substantial library of somebody with special training in official documents is a desirable facility, not only for the immediate purposes of users, but in order to enhance the value of the collection in arrangement and access. The replies to Question 27 show that the proportion of respondents with this facility is less than half (42%); but of these 73% required some special qualification - most often a professional library qualification, as well as experience in the field-for their Official Documents Librarian. Obviously some libraries are too small or limited in collecting objective to be able to justify this luxury. The cross-question analysis establishes this: 51% of libraries which aim to collect comprehensively have a specific official documents librarian, against 34% which aim to collect at less than that level.

Table 11 illustrates the weighting in favour of North America and Australia, and the comparatively poor showing of Europe. National libraries have less specialised qualification than might be expected; public libraries are barely represented.

TABLE 11. LIBRARIES WITH OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS LIBRARIANS

Geographical Area	Official Documents Librarian		Qualification		Type of Library	Official Documents Librarian		Qualification	
	No.	%	No.	%		No.	%	No.	%
Europe	26	33	14	18	National State Parliamentary	16	35	12	26
North America	28	76	24	65		12	63	10	53
South America & Caribbean	5	28	5	28		11	50	7	31
Africa	9	38	7	29	Administrative	4	15	1	4
Australasia/ Oceania	12	52	10	43	University Public	33	58	26	46
Asia & Far East	2	13	-	-		6	21	4	14

45. Official publications have special characteristics related to their origins and content, and are more difficult for the user to identify and trace within libraries than the generality of titles identifiable with ease by means of author, title and publisher, or by subject. The replies to Questions 28 and 29 suggest that users do not receive a great deal of ready guidance to them. 67% of respondents have no printed guide available to their official publications collections; 45% take no special measures to draw attention to their accessibility; only 14% report notices in their libraries, and almost none advertise the presence of an official publications collection outside their own libraries. A substantial collection of this sort is still something of a rarity outside large cities, and not always well-known within them to those who may have the occasional need to seek access to an official publication. The cross-question analysis shows that 43% of libraries with a specific official documents libraries take positive steps to make their collections known, while only 20% of libraries without an official documents librarian do so.
46. The replies to Question 30 show that in larger libraries, at least, official publications are often not all on open shelves, which tend to be restricted to books of a reference type. It is understandable that space limitations are the most usual reasons for closed access, though this is a restriction on browsing among official material; there is also a heavy weighting (46% of respondents) of security considerations, not only from developing countries where publications are not easy for readers to obtain for themselves outside the library, and their issue is controlled. It is, however, to be noted that virtually all respondents report that official publications not housed on open shelves can be made very quickly accessible - almost without exception on the same day, and mostly (76% of respondents) within a couple of hours or less. National libraries exercise the greatest degree of security restriction (70%).
47. Question 31 adds a further dimension to the delays apparent from question 19 in making official publications available to users. A high proportion - 39% - of respondents take more than two weeks after they receive publications to have them available for use, and the general performance shown is far from sparkling. 62% report delays in internal processes as a cause of delay in availability. Accompanying comment often notes that periodicals and serials are usually available more quickly than monographs - e.g. "periodicals, 1 day; books, more than two weeks". The cumulation of delays in receipt and internal handling must mean that libraries are anything

but a current source of official publications, and that for a significant proportion of publications there may be a lapse of several months or more before they are available to users. This must detract from the value of library collections of official publications of current interest, and should be capable of improvement within the profession. National and state libraries figure prominently. Geographically, North and South America rank equally as the most frequent reporters of internal delays (78%).

SECTION D. - INTERLENDING

48. As has been shown, official publications collections in libraries are far from complete, or, so far as they go, reliable. Interlending is therefore a valuable mechanism for dealing with deficiencies. By nature, however, this will not be a mechanism for immediate satisfaction. The replies to Question 33 suggest that, for those libraries - about 50% of respondents - which take part in interlending arrangements the mechanism is generally effective, though such causes of delay as the difficulty in identification and handling time seem capable of reduction. North America is the most highly developed area for this facility.

SECTION E. - ARRANGEMENT AND CATALOGUING

Arrangement

49. Users do not receive an excessive amount of information about or guidance to official publications collections (Questions 28 and 29). In finding their way not merely to their immediate needs, but also to what exists, of which they may not be fully aware, those who are not used to the peculiarities of the field will be heavily dependent on the personal guidance of librarians and on the arrangement and cataloguing of the collection which are thus of particular importance. The arrangement of official publications collections has engaged much professional attentions in this light. Table 12 shows that practice is very varied, that wholly integrated collections (42%) predominate, and that North America, and, to a lesser extent, Africa, are the only areas where wholly separate collections are in the majority (46%), though this arrangement is in the minority overall. Among types of libraries, state, parliamentary and university libraries show a tendency to wholly separate arrangement, but the general picture is similar. There are clear associations with Table 11, which shows the major concentrations of official documents libraries in the same types of libraries, and very markedly in North America. Same further aspects are examined later from the cross-question analysis.

TABLE 12. ARRANGEMENT OF OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS STOCKS

Geographical Area						Types of library							
	Wholly separate		Part- ially separate		Wholly inte- grated			Wholly separate		Part- ially separate		Wholly inte- grated	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Europe	10	13	26	33	41	53	National	8	17	13	28	25	54
N. America	17	46	13	25	7	19	State	6	32	3	16	9	47
S. America	3	17	5	28	10	56	Parlia- mentary	8	36	6	27	8	36
							38						

Geographical Area					Types of Library								
	Wholly separate		Part- ially separate		Wholly inte- grated			Wholly separate		Part- ially separate		Wholly inte- grated	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%		No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Africa	10	42	5	21	9	38	Admin.	3	11	8	30	14	52
Australasia	3	13	10	43	9	39	Univ.	16	28	24	42	15	26
Asia	2	13	7	44	6	38	Public	4	14	12	43	12	43
General Totals	45	23	67	34	84	42		45	23	66	33	83	42

50. In all areas and in all types of libraries the practice is substantially to have partially separate collections. Comment accompanying replies indicates that a good deal of this results from another classification - that between periodicals, serials and monographs. Different areas of official publications are often separated in this way. It can be argued that the arrangement of the collection is a matter of professional judgement on which the arguments are never likely to be conclusive or the basic material uniform in type or proportions. The user's immediate interest, however, is to know on what basis the collection is organised. 23% of respondents do give some immediate indication by means of notices displayed in the library, and 39 % do so by means of notes in catalogues and indexes, which the user is likely to consult. It is surprising to find that as many as 46% of respondents give no special indication at all for a body of publications so notoriously difficult to trace and use in relation to any subject of study.

51. Cataloguing

Cataloguing practice may therefore be considered even more important than the arrangement of the collection. Replies show it to be very mixed indeed. The variety of special practices in use, on their own or

superimposed on general systems, as indicated in much supplementary comment on Question 35, indicates the difficulties which librarians feel in providing means of reference to this class of material. Some form of entry in the main catalogue is common, but often incomplete, or merely indicative, though complete coverage by subject, title and author/issuing source predominates. 56% of respondent libraries catalogue fully by author or issuing source, 45% by title and 44% by subject. Only 9% of respondent libraries exclude official publications altogether from their main library catalogues, but a substantial minority catalogue them selectively by class or by item (understandable enough where there are categories of e.g. regulatory material issued in standard, serially numbered form, though on the face of it this calls for some cross-referencing which can identify an item and subject). The most frequently used form of entry, for complete or selective coverage, is by author/issuing source-almost certainly in this context issuing source. Selective cataloguing tends to prefer subject to title entry. Given the complications of cataloguing this material, this extent of complete coverage seems reasonably satisfactory; there is no norm which could find general acceptance, and the more extensive the collection the more thought is likely to be given to the extent of cataloguing in relation to the type of use received.

52. The majority of respondents - 59%-do not have a separate official publications catalogue; the substantial minority which do - 33% - again tend to use author/issuing source as the most frequent method. Unsatisfactory as issuing source may be in theory as a tracing basis, it clearly has an advantage in this field, because of the diffusion of official publications over the structure of government, over other kinds of entry, such as subject and title, which normally give the essential tracing clues. Relatively few respondents (19%) use the catalogue material put out by issuing sources, which is often bibliographically deficient and impossibly late in appearance,

as their sole means of identification. It is more used as a pre-catalogue search source but only 30% annotate it as finding aids. Commercially produced catalogues and indexes are not to be found in many countries, but where they exist they are used more as supplements to official material rather than as primary sources, even in North America, where the U.S.A. has commercially-published indexes of high quality.

Question 36, on cross-referencing from main library catalogues, produces a curious result: some 60% of respondents claim to use forms of cross-referencing, author/issuing source again being the most frequent - 25%; but the volume of answers is very low about the form of cross-referencing used, except, as one might expect, cross-referencing to separate official publications catalogues. Comment with replies suggests that most of them do not deal with cross-referencing as the question puts it, but with cross-referencing only within the main library catalogue between the headings in Question 36.2.a.

53. A great many idiosyncratic variations on cataloguing systems are in use, among them an interesting variety of computer-produced material, in the form of "browsing lists" keyed to locations, keyword indexes, computer printouts of serials, and complete entry on data bases. Manual variations include the use of special index cards to draw attention, special arrangement in general catalogues, and so on. The amount of ingenuity applied points up the special problems which librarians feel in cataloguing official publications on any standard system.
54. Nevertheless, the majority - 68% - of respondents are satisfied in the replies to Question 37 that their cataloguing and reference systems are adequate for the needs of users. (It would be interesting to know how far the views of users support this conclusion). But of the 27% of

respondents who do not think their systems adequate the great majority have plans for improving them within the next five years. This seems a healthy degree of self-doubt.

55. There are obvious associations between a number of the characteristics and factors discussed, best viewed by composite extracts from the cross-question analyses. Even if not conclusive, some of these give food for more thought and may suggest some lines for professional study, both generally and in relation to the area and type analyses. Table 13, 14 and 15 attempt to associate factors and figures relating to levels and methods of collection, deposit, arrangement of collections, cataloguing and aspects of library management. It would be confusing to attempt to combine these completely in tabular form, and the Tables as shown, with a few comments, do not exhaust the possible associations.
56. The most general method of treating official publications collections is to integrate them into the main library stock and the main library catalogue. 66 libraries (33%) do this, and 30 (15%) integrate their stocks but only give selective cataloguing.

Libraries with wholly separate stocks are to be found mainly in North America and Africa, which also rank high for official documents librarians, though Australasia, also well provided with official documents librarians, tends to integrate stocks. And separate official publications catalogues tend to run with wholly separate stocks, but by no means exclusively. Libraries with wholly integrated stocks clearly rely on their main catalogues, and libraries giving selective catalogue coverage only lean most heavily on the use of published lists and indexes. This might be an overall economy of cataloguing effort, but is likely to call for most personal guidance from librarians and, perhaps, difficulty for users.

57. A high proportion of libraries with deposit lend to some users, and the proportion of lending, at around 70%, even to the general public, cannot be said to be restrictive, though many of the institutional libraries involved lend as a matter of function to their particular users (e.g. universities). Libraries with wholly integrated stocks clearly tend to regard official publications as requiring less bringing to attention in some way than others. This seems consistent with the arrangement, but does not seem to lessen the need to inform users.

TABLE 13. CROSS-QUESTION ANALYSIS: CATALOGUING AND HANDLING OF OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS COLLECTIONS

Libraries with:	Full coverage in main library catalogue	Selective coverage in main library catalogue	No entries in main library catalogue	A special official publications catalogue	A specific official documents librarian	Special guides & notes in library
fully integrated stocks <u>and</u>	66 (78%)	12 (14%)	3 (3.7%)	7 (8%)	19 (23%)	29 (35%)
partially separate stocks <u>and</u> :	30 (45%)	28 (42%)	4 (6%)	31 (46%)	32 (48%)	-
completely separate stocks <u>and</u> :	17 (38%)	17 (38%)	9 (20%)	28 (62%)	28 (62%)	-

Libraries with:	Deposit of some kind	Aim at comprehensive collection	Collect less than comprehensive by
Fully integrated stocks <u>and</u>	56 (66%)	34 (40%)	44 (52%)
Partially separate stocks <u>and</u>	49 (73%)	25 (37%)	46 (69%)
Wholly separate stocks <u>and</u>	36 (43%)	25 (29%)	22 (26%)

Libraries:	Wholly integrated stock	Partially separate	Wholly separate stock	Separate official publications catalogue	No special official publications catalogue	Use of published lists & indexes
giving complete coverage in main library catalogue <u>and</u> :	66 (59%)	30 (27%)	17 (15%)	28 (25%)	83 (79%)	37 (35%)
giving selective coverage in main library catalogue <u>and</u> :	12 (18%)	28 (40%)	17 (25%)	43 (62%)	26 (38%)	47 (68%)
giving no coverage in main library catalogue <u>and</u> :	3 (18%)	4 (24%)	9 (53%)	13 (77%)	4 (25%)	6 (36%)

Libraries:	Wholly integrated stock	Partially separate	Wholly separate stock	Separate official publications catalogue	No special official publications catalogue	Use of published lists & indexes
with a separate official pubs. catalogue <u>and</u> :	7 (11%)	31 (47%)	28 (42%)	-	-	-

Libraries:	Full coverage in main catalogue	Selective coverage in main catalogue	No entries for official publications in main library catalogue	A specific official documents librarian
with a separate official publications catalogue <u>and</u> :	28 (44%)	43 (65%)	13 (19%)	46 (69%)

Libraries with:	Fully integrated stocks	Partially separate stocks	Completely separate stocks	Special notices/guides to official publications	Aiming at comprehensive collection	Aiming at less than comprehensive collection
specific official documents librarian <u>and</u> :	19 (23%)	32 (39%)	28 (33%)	34 (41%)	43 (51%)	36 (43%)

Libraries with:	Full coverage in main library catalogue	Selective coverage in main library catalogue	No official pubs. in main library catalogue	A separate official pubs. catalogue	Deposit privileges of some kind
a specific official documents librarian <u>and</u> :				46 (55%)	65 (78%)

TABLE 14. CROSS-QUESTION ANALYSIS. COLLECTING LEVELS AND LIBRARY CHARACTERISTICS

Libraries with:	Fully integrated stock of official publications	Partially ~~separate~~ stock of official publications	Completely separate stock of official publications	Specific official documents librarian	Deposit privileges of some kind
aiming at comprehensive collection <u>with:</u>	34 (40%)	25 (29%)	25 (29%)	43 (51%)	73 (86%)
aiming at less than comprehensive collection <u>with:</u>	44 (42%)	46 (44%)	22 (21%)	36 (34%)	74 (70%)

Libraries:	Supplement deposit with gifts	Supplement deposit with purchase	Open to the general public
aiming to collect comprehensively <u>and</u>	67 (79%)	53 (62%)	54 (63%)
aiming to collect less than comprehensively <u>and</u>	50 (48%)	58 (55%)	66 (63%)

Libraries:	Wholly integrated stocks	Partially separate stocks	Wholly separate stocks	Specific official documents librarian
with deposit privileges <u>and</u>	56 (38%)	49 (33%)	36 (24%)	65 (44%)

Libraries:	Supplement deposit with gifts	Supplement deposit with purchase	Open to the general public
with deposit privileges <u>and</u>	121 (82%)	100 (68%)	112 (76%)

TABLE 15. CROSS-QUESTION ANALYSIS. LENDING AND ACCESSIBILITY

Libraries:	Lend at all		No special indication of official publications collection		Provide notices displayed in library		Provide notes in catalogue	
	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
accessible to general public <u>and</u>	79	70						
accessible only to public with special interest <u>and</u>	29	66						
accessible only to members of the institution <u>and</u>	44	77						
open only to research- ers from other institutions <u>and</u>	37	75						
with wholly or par- tially separate stocks <u>and</u>			37	36	38	36	50	47
with wholly integrated stocks <u>and</u>			49	61				
with deposit of any kind <u>and</u>	105	71			29			36
Specific official documents librarian			49	(59%)				

SECTION F. - AMOUNT AND TYPES OF USE AND USERS

59. It is possible to regard the library simply as a resource in being regardless of the types and extent of the use which it receives e.g. national libraries, some university libraries. There must be many libraries, however, in which knowledge of use is an important part of both professional and cost-effective management. Few libraries record systematically on these aspects; no doubt many of them would regard it as a waste of effort. Records of use seem to be unrelated to any systematic framework, and the majority of respondents - 57% - keep no records at all. Even more - 73% - keep no records of the type or purposes of users; but many academic libraries with substantial official publications collections take it as natural that their users will be predominantly students and researchers. Of those keeping no records 51%, mainly in North America and Africa, were able to give good impressions of the extent and types of use. Comment often mentions the amount of use by government users. Government libraries are usually closely related to the work of particular departments and departmental researchers in wider official fields almost inevitably fall back on non-government libraries for reference to collections of official publications. Government archives are often not organised for easy access or reference. Governments themselves, therefore, have some interest for their own purposes in the existence and organisation of adequate library collections of official publications.
60. Question 41 has a relevance to the utility of various types of official publications. It is a frequent complaint that governments publish too much; little is known about the interest which users have in various classes of official material. The question was not adequately answered by many librarians, but from valid replies statistics (unsurprisingly) have a clear lead for first place, while the general ranking order suggests that e.g. serial annual reports and monographs do not seem so important to users as their issuing authorities may think. Some feedback between library associations and governments might have value in both directions in regulation of the types and volume of official publications.

SECTION G. - OFFICIAL PUBLISHING BY LOCAL (INCLUDING MUNICIPAL) AUTHORITIES

61. Local publications by subordinate authorities within jurisdictions are a growing body of official material and a problem to librarians, but the questions involved would be too extensive to explore in depth in this study. Some general questions were included in Question 42, to gain an

impression. It is of interest to know that 72% of respondent libraries do collect this material, and that 32% have more than 4 tiers of local etc. authorities to contend with. Tracing the output of such bodies suffers from severe bibliographic deficiency. There are some published lists, but the great majority of libraries have to make use of unpublished lists and other means (which means in practice, from comment received, a good deal of time-consuming personal contact and scanning of newspapers) to find what they want. Tracing difficulties predominate, with a substantial margin of procurement difficulty. Publications from these sources are rarely covered by deposit law or instruction, and this is a field which needs to be explored in a deeper way. Some local authorities are co-operative, but the general picture is unsatisfactory, and a systematic basis of collection is lacking. All types of libraries in all areas collect these publications substantially, and the problems are general. Difficulties of tracing and procurement are reported by a high proportion of libraries in North America and Australasia.

62. SECTION H. - INTERGOVERNMENTAL PUBLICATIONS

This section of the questionnaire was designed to do no more than test the involvement of participating libraries in the field of intergovernmental publications. It is not directed specifically at libraries specialising in such collections, but the replies show that the great majority of respondents in all areas, ranging from 69-89%, but perceptibly less in public libraries than in others, do collect publications of intergovernmental agencies - only 9% return a negative reply. Only 16% of respondents confine themselves to regional collections; 34% collect for subject coverage; but the majority - 50% - collect for coverage of specific organisations or groups - e.g. the United Nations "family". The general tendency is to integrate these collections with the general library collection, though a substantial minority - 22% - maintain a special collection. 44% of respondents receive deposits from particular organisations, and these are sometimes kept separately from other publications of intergovernmental organisations acquired in pursuit of domestic collecting policies.

63. The mechanical difficulties of collecting in this field come in for pointed and widespread comment. All the causes of difficulty in Question 43.5.1 attract substantial notice, including difficulty in obtaining lists and catalogues, however inadequate. Comment after comment calls for more and better bibliographic and distribution

information, more co-ordination between agencies and improvements in distribution and purchasing arrangements, especially the provision of local agencies. Libraries may not always be calling for the most feasible solutions to their problems, but these are not new complaints about a field of collection which has always been difficult, and for obvious reasons is likely to remain so. But respondent libraries very clearly signal very specific needs for improvements, and a great deal of unsatisfactory experience. English, French and Spanish are the most preferred languages. Other preferences were not significant in number.

64. Only 8% of respondent libraries state that they use any of the variety of information, indexing and retrieval systems to be found in this field, some of them highly developed. AGRIS is most frequently mentioned. This must give some food for thought about the systems themselves; but collection of intergovernmental organisations' publications and documents, and the use made of their information and indexing systems, are library activities which would require a far more specialised survey to evaluate with any precision, taking in a rather different range of libraries. The co-operation of the intergovernmental agencies themselves would also be necessary to arrive at any firm conclusions.

V. DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

65. Distribution of the questionnaire included 267 copies, 47% of the total distribution, to libraries in developing countries, as classified in the U.N. Statistical Yearbook, in South America and the Caribbean, the Middle East, Asia and the Far East:

TABLE 16. - DISTRIBUTION OF QUESTIONNAIRE TO DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

	Countries	Questionnaires
South America and Caribbean	11 (9)	80 (19)
Africa	21 (14)	93 (25)
Middle East	6 (2)	38 (4)
Asia and Far East, Oceania	9 (6)	56 (11)
	<u>47 (31)</u>	<u>267 (59)</u>

- Notes: 1. Numbers of responses are shown in brackets
 2. Two completed questionnaires were received too late for analysis.

66. Returned questionnaires constitute only 29% of the 199 replies analysed, but developing countries constitute 48% of those included in the overall analysis (Appendix A) and the type analysis (Appendix C). The Middle East was omitted from the area analysis (Appendix B) because of the very small number of replies which were from two countries only. Of the 31 countries from which any response was received only two returned more than three completed questionnaires, so that the response was wide, but thinly spread, without causing serious distortions. Deductions from some of the figures for particular countries would however have to be treated with reserve in the face of such small samples. But in general replies from developing countries, as from others, established the main characteristics for areas from relatively small numbers, and additional replies reinforced these rather than altered them significantly. While a greater number of replies would have been welcome the results of the analyses in terms of main characteristics are considered reasonably representative.
67. Detailed analyses suggest at a number of points that library development is firmer in countries of Africa than in other areas where developing countries predominate. Table 3. suggests that this may be associated with more recent formation; 55% of respondent libraries in Africa are less than 20 years old, a substantially higher proportion than elsewhere. Collecting objectives are ambitious - Africa has the highest proportion of exhaustive collection (Table 5) - though the volume of official publishing is less than in more developed areas. Africa has the highest proportion of deposit (Table 8). In collecting objectives and achievement Africa aims higher and does better than South America (Appendix B, Question 3) and is roughly on a par with Asia and the Far East, for which the figures shown include Japan, as well as developing countries. In official documents librarians Africa leads the field of developing areas (and is better off proportionately than Europe). Other similar points will be noted from the analyses. Standards of training and the existence of library schools no doubt contribute to this position.

68. Developing countries do not generally have the broad levels of education and resources which underlie the standards of library development in developed areas of the world, though some of their library institutions are well-established historically and professionally. But both the generation and the distribution of official publications are related closely to the degree of development of administration, the stability of government, and similar factors beyond the ability of libraries to influence in any way. The very high rate of tracing difficulty reported from South America particularly (94% of respondents) tells its own story. Books are a scarce resource in many developing countries with e.g. currency difficulties, and although South American and African libraries tend to more caution in some respects in their custodial and lending policies (and some more developed areas are surprisingly cautious) practice is by no means illiberal (Questions 26 and 30.2.). The difficulties encountered in general access to official publications in the normal way must emphasise the importance of having sound collections available in libraries of all kinds.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

69. i. The majority of respondent libraries have official publications collections of long standing and wide range - 74% for more than 20 years, 92% with a history of continuous acquisition, and 74% collecting comprehensively or exhaustively. The spread and detail of replies reflects the disposition of official publications collections among types of libraries and the general levels of development in various geographical areas. The geographical spread is wide (56 countries). More replies would have provided more solid support statistically in the analyses made; but the characteristics of availability and use of official publications in libraries are nevertheless consistently indicated and firmly established from the 205 replies received, of which 199 were analysed. The response rate from developing countries was low (29%) as a proportion of replies analysed, but constitutes 48% of the countries covered. The replies are considered reasonably representative of these areas for the purposes of the project.
- ii. By the general standards prevailing many respondent libraries would be considered to have good collections of official publications. However, there is a significant degree of failure to attain collecting objectives, whatever their level may be, and these are generally set at a lower level for the "fringe" bodies of government than for the clearly definable corpus of central government organisation. These, and other causes, produce widespread gaps in subject, period and source continuity which must adversely affect the range and coherence of collections in 37% of respondent libraries, and modify the impression of historical continuity.
- iii. Deposit is the dominant means of collecting official publications, and 76% of respondent libraries report deposit of some kind. 53% of libraries are dependent on deposit for 75-100% of their official publications collections. Only 14% rely on purchase to the same degree. Donation and purchase are widely used by libraries, but principally as a means of infilling and supplementing collections. Libraries receive in general very little financial concession on their purchases; though they may be supported in other ways, their role as a major means of the dissemination of information in official publications suggests that more direct assistance might be given to them in purchasing. Many collections

are used by government officials in their work. Public libraries are the worst served by deposit arrangements, though in many cases they are a local and immediate resource, and a greater degree of deposit could be a desirable improvement in general public accessibility to official publications, particularly for the occasional user.

iv. Libraries may tend to be too ambitious in their collecting objectives for official publications; around 30-34% of them report a success rate of 75% or less, 15-20% of them less than 50%. In relation to the prevalence of deposit this suggests serious weaknesses in deposit arrangements, or shortcomings in library procedures for collecting, or in both. There is some evidence of looseness in library procedures for checking on deposits received (though this may be at least partly due to lack of checkable data). But the deficiencies in deposit collections are mainly the result of structural deficiencies in deposit arrangements and their operation. These arise from:

- a. inadequate coverage of deposit laws and instructions.
Only 45% of respondent libraries report that these cover over 80% of official sources within their jurisdiction;
- b. inadequate definition of terms on which deposit systems rest, terms which establish the framework of deposit in range, sources, recipients and material being almost twice as often defined or described as terms which are vital to practical operation (Question 6.) The general level of definition and description for all these terms, which have legal or quasi-legal effect, is low overall. Between 25% and 51% only of all respondent libraries, and 33-67% of libraries with deposit arrangements, give positive answers;
- c. defects in compliance and administrative arrangements by issuing sources, partly as a result of inadequate definition; these attract note from 32% and 28% of respondents respectively;
- d. inadequacy and lateness of bibliographic records of official publications. These are the working tools for the effective operation of deposit systems, but for many respondents this is the basic defect; in many countries it is very difficult for librarians to know what official publications are being issued. Difficulties in tracing publications are mentioned

by 59% of respondents, and in identifying sources by 25%. There is an abundance of comment. These difficulties are particularly marked in South America and the Caribbean, where as many as 94% of respondents report difficulty in tracing publications issued.

- v. These deficiencies will not be news to librarians. But the existence of deposit systems ought to be a virtual guarantee of adequate collections of official publications within their scope. In a great variety of political and administrative circumstances it would be sensible to recognise that perfection is unattainable. But there is nevertheless obvious scope for improvement. The intensity of the problems varies from area to area, but they are world-wide in occurrence, as are the causes. In some countries the deficiencies in official bibliography and organisation must almost preclude systematic collection.

Although much is said and written about them professionally, there is an obvious need for action. Any general improvement would require some co-ordinated effort on a world-wide scale vis-à-vis governments to try to lay down higher standards of definition, bibliography and operational efficiency. This would possibly best be done by agreement between library associations and major international bodies to bring some coherent influence to bear on governments for the policy decisions which alone are likely to achieve major improvements. Some international standards for the form and coverage of legislation or instruction, for minimum bibliographic standards and for some joint machinery between governments and professional library bodies could greatly strengthen the existing arrangements, which involve much effort by libraries to achieve substantially incomplete results which must detract from the value of the government expenditures concerned, as well as from the value of the collections. Over time, a positive programme kept under regular review internationally should produce more uniform standards and increased effectiveness. Linkage to the improvement of public information could supply a coherent driving force. The establishment of a specific body in each country to oversee the operation of deposit arrangements would in itself be a major improvement; deposit legislation and instruction rarely contains any machinery of co-ordination and enforcement. Some concerted international action

might also be able to level up standards of deposit in developing countries, particularly in South America and Asia, where published material is often difficult to obtain and a systematic library collection of official publications is a valuable educational and research resource.

- vi. The importance of deposit should not be allowed, however, to obscure the need to improve purchase arrangements, which are very widely used to some degree for infilling (a reflection often of the inadequacy of deposit administration) and for extra copies and replacements. Many libraries experience difficulty and delay in purchasing, and this is another facet which might be brought to the attention of governments through international machinery.
- vii. More than half of respondent libraries hold significant amounts of unpublished official material, some of it under restriction. The provision of bibliographic reference and access conditions to such collections might be the subject of further enquiry within countries. The incidence is particularly high in North America and Africa (both more than 70% of respondents in those areas).
- viii. Microform seems underused as a mode of collecting official material. The incidence is highest in North America and Australia, where there is substantial official publishing in microform only. Microform is now commonly used as a matter of course in many libraries for reference purposes, and readers are widely accustomed to it. There might be wider consideration of the use of microform for space-saving at least, particularly for material which is mainly for reference - 75% of respondent libraries do not weed their collections. This might mean more persuasion of governments to publish in original or alternative in this mode, or the encouragement of commercial operators, who have often met with success in this field, to do so, possibly with official support.

Availability

- ix. Collections of official publications tend to be concentrated in academic and institutional libraries. Many regular users of official publications in specific fields obtain their own, of course, without

necessarily resorting to library collections, particularly if they are current users (e.g. legal, commercial, technical). But for the public with an occasional interest, or for students outside higher academic institutions, many existing collections are not in libraries of obvious first resort, even though the wider public is able to find access to many of them. Appendix C. shows public libraries to be less well-off than other types in many respects for official publications, though a surprising proportion of them do attempt to collect comprehensively or exhaustively (72%). Their deposit arrangements are comparatively poor, and they show a high rate of gaps in their collections. Wider availability of official publications in public libraries could be achieved by improved deposit arrangements, purchasing concessions (25% of public libraries rely totally on purchase), or both, and the survey suggests that more attention needs to be given to these outlets for official publications, which are an immediate and local resource for many users who would not readily resort to other types of libraries.

- x. Collections of official publications are on the whole anything but a current source of reference. Another suitable subject for general review is the time taken to make the publication actually available to the reader. Time-lags of up to a month or more in receipt of official publications by collecting libraries seem to call for review of the supply machinery; many libraries compound the delay by internal processes of cataloguing and binding (reported by 62% of respondents) which may result in a further two weeks or more before the publication reaches the shelves. Only 31% of respondents make official publications received available within three days. Periodicals and serials, however, are often on the shelves with minimum delay.
- xi. The amount of attention given to collections and their ease of accessibility through guidance notices and catalogue and collection arrangement are important measures of availability, and more attention is likely to be given to collections where there is a specific official documents librarian. There are obvious correlations between the presence of an official documents librarian (42% of respondents), segregated collections, indicative information and comprehensiveness of cataloguing. North America has the highest proportion of official documents librarians and the highest proportion of segregated collections. Africa stands out from other developing areas, and is better served

in this respect than Europe. There are, however, no final answers to many of the intensely professional questions involved. What is clear is that standards of guidance and cataloguing are very variable, and that users who are inexperienced in this type of material will often be perhaps too dependent on the personal guidance of a member of the library staff. Some minimum standard seems to need laying down internationally for guidance to users no matter how a collection is supervised and arranged. This should include explanation of the country's official publishing system, how the particular collection relates to it, and a careful description of the cataloguing system in use, including cross-referencing. There should be adequate publicity within the library (and perhaps within local educational establishments and by occasional public notices) for the existence of the collection, and it should be usable with the minimum of specialised information or knowledge. General standards are often incomplete in these respects. The majority of respondents do not have a separate official publications catalogue, and do not have a high degree of complete coverage or of cross-referencing in their main catalogues. The number of special systems of adaptation and notation which are mentioned in comment indicates the difficulties which librarians recognise in this material and it would not be practicable to try to suggest cataloguing and referencing systems which would suit the variety and range of collections. But in the last resort the needs of the user must be paramount, and the library's system aligned to them. The data in the report, particularly in the **cross-question** analysis, might be a basis for further professional exploration of these important and often technical questions which might be able to suggest a preferred range of cataloguing and reference methods, especially for the guidance of those libraries whose needs would not justify a high degree of professional qualification in official publications.

Use and Users

- xii. Replies to the questionnaire are firm that official publishing is generally increasing in volume, and this must be a consideration in library management of substantial official publications collections. Many libraries, however, display little detailed knowledge of the ways in which these collections are used. This is not only a management function, but also a means of dialogue with issuing authorities,

who may not always have clear ideas about the utility of the publications they issue - official publishing is not subject to the normal considerations of commercial viability, not always mandatory, and not necessarily issued in the most convenient forms for use. There is always a margin of dubious value. Some more systematic information about use and users could often be of value in these questions. There is, of course, a good deal of subjective knowledge in libraries, but occasional detailed surveys of use and users over short periods could produce more solid information, and if centrally concerted over a number and range of libraries in particular countries could bring an impressive range of expertise to bear on issuing authorities to modify, improve, consolidate, or even eliminate some of their publishing, making it generally easier and more informative for use and reference. This seems one of the most useful functions to which the experience of libraries with official publications collections could be harnessed; there is no other similar source of this kind of knowledge.

Publishing by Local (including Municipal) Authorities

- xiii. This is a widely collected form of official publishing whose status and volume differs from country to country, but which clearly causes libraries a disproportionate amount of trouble. It is generally unorganised in issue, has a minimum of bibliographic reference available and has no special basis of supply to libraries. In view of the extent to which it is collected and the intrinsic importance of a great deal of it some systematic attention seems to need giving to the possibility of its inclusion within deposit systems and to the provision of adequate bibliographic and supply systems, in order to improve what seem at present often rather too haphazard methods of collection over-dependent on personal effort.

Publications of Intergovernmental Organisations

- xiv. The replies and supplementary comment to the limited range of questions asked produced a volume of criticism about the difficulties involved in collecting these publications which is not new, but is of long standing in this field. This outcome might be brought to the attention of the principal organisations and of bodies concerned with these publications generally. It is obvious that

these difficulties, though much discussed over the years, are a long way from effective solution or amelioration, and many of them are mechanical and organisational rather than technical. A point which should be noted is the apparently very restricted use made of the specialised information and indexing systems originating from intergovernmental organisations; though the sample of libraries was not selected for any such specialisation no less than 72% of respondents do collect intergovernmental organisations' publications.

- xv. These conclusions touch on main issues which emerge. Many others may suggest themselves from study of the data in the Appendices, and may be a basis for further professional exploration, to develop a body of ascertained fact as a basis for seeking improvements in official publications collections and their utility. The prevalence of deposit and the wide use of purchase (often to remedy the deficiencies of deposit) make improvement largely dependent on governments and issuing authorities at various levels. Pressures, therefore, might be most effectively aimed at securing policy decisions which will accept the public responsibility of strengthening the role of libraries in seeing that the best value is obtained from what are considerable public expenditures. For relatively marginal improvements a great deal more value could be obtained even from existing systems. The involvement of government in the daily life of the community everywhere is steadily increasing. Official publishing is increasing with it, and availability and access become more important to more people. Libraries have a unique role in this, with key potential, and require more effective support.

IFLA OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS SECTION

QUESTIONNAIRE ON AVAILABILITY AND USE OF OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS

JURISDICTION*

1. Name of library

2. Full address of library

.....
.....
.....

3. Enquiries about completed questionnaire to be made to:

Telephone Extension

Telex

4. Name and organisation title of officer responsible for
official publications collection

.....
.....

5. Name and organisation title of officer signing the completed
questionnaire (if different from above)

.....
.....

* i.e. political or administrative area to which you should refer in your answer.

SECTION A

ACQUISITION AND COLLECTION

Do not
mark this
columnQUESTION I. HISTORY

1. 1. How long has your library collected official publications?

less than
10 years11 - 20
yearmore than
20 years☐ 15 (8%)☐ 34 (17%)☐ 47 (74%)

1 2 3

2. Has acquisition of official publications been continuous over this period?

YES ☐ 183 (92%)NO ☐ 15 (8%)

1 2

3. Are there significant gaps in the collection?

in subject
continuityin period
continuityin continuity
of sourcesa. YES ☐ 76 (37%)☐ 34 (17%)☐ 65 (33%)☐ 47 (24%)

1 2 3 4 5

b. NO ☐ 101 (51%)

4. If your answer is YES, what are the causes?

changes in
library
acquisition
policychanges in
basis of
depositweeding
collec-
tionaccidental
loss or
destruction☐ 37 (19%)☐ 22 (11%)☐ 10 (5%)☐ 32 (16%)

1 2 3 4

II. LEVELS OF COLLECTING

2. 1. How would you describe your library's level of collection of official publications in the terms stated in Appendix A para 3

highly select-
ive

selective

comprehen
sive

exhaustive

☐ 21 (11%)☐ 29 (15%)☐ 71 (36%)☐ 76 (38%)

1 2 3 4

3. 1. What estimated proportion does your library attempt to collect of official publications from the sources covered by the Definition of an Official Source at Appendix A?

	up to 50%	more than 50% but not all	all	
a. Categories i-iii	34 (17%)	64 (32%)	89 (45%)	1 2 3
b. category iv	60 (30%)	48 (24%)	69 (30%)	1 2 3

2. How far do you achieve these objectives? (tick one box only in each line applicable)

	less than 50%	50%-75%	more than 75% but not totally	totally	
a. categories i-iii	30 (15%)	38 (19%)	92 (46%)	28 (14%)	1 2 3 4
b. category iv	50 (25%)	36 (18%)	65 (33%)	13 (7%)	1 2 3 4

III METHODS OF COLLECTING - DEPOSIT (QUESTIONS 4 - 11: IF NOT APPLICABLE GO TO QUESTION 12)

4. 1. Does your library receive deposits of official publications from sources within your jurisdiction?

	full deposits	selective deposits	no deposits	
a. by legal right or	66 (33%)	11 (6%)	18 (9%)	1 2 3
b. by administrative instruction or	39 (18%)	18 (9%)	13 (7%)	1 2 3
c. on both bases, according to the type of source or	14 (7%)	3 (2%)	12 (8%)	1 2 3
d. by custom or working agreement as the <u>only basis of deposit</u>	6 (3%)	19 (10%)	16 (8%)	1 2 3

Please: cite reference to law or instruction
attach copy of text if possible. (USA depository libraries need not attach copies of Title 44 and "Government Depository Libraries").

2. Does your library receive deposits from official sources in other Jurisdictions within your country, on any basis?

	full deposits	selective deposits	no deposits	
a. YES				
	☐ 97 (49%)	☐ 41 (21%)	☐ 43 (22%)	☐ 3 (2%)
				1 2
b. NO				
	☐			
				1

5. 1. How far does law or administrative instruction cover the range of official sources within your jurisdiction as defined in Appendix A to this questionnaire?

Under 50%	50%-80%	over 80%	
☐ 74 (7%)	☐ 38 (19%)	☐ 89 (45%)	1 2 3

6. 1. Do deposit laws or administrative instructions or other legal or official documents define, describe or list the following?

	YES	NO	
a. "publications"	☐ 92 (46%)	☐ 32 (16%)	1 2
b. "official"	☐ 50 (25%)	☐ 60 (30%)	1 2
c. "government"	☐ 51 (26%)	☐ 60 (30%)	1 2
d. government departments	☐ 53 (27%)	☐ 55 (28%)	1 2
e. the range of publications to be deposited	☐ 94 (47%)	☐ 20 (10%)	1 2
f. the sources obliged to deposit	☐ 82 (41%)	☐ 34 (17%)	1 2
g. the libraries entitled to receive deposits	☐ 102 (51%)	☐ 17 (9%)	1 2

- h. Where appropriate please: cite references to documents or sources
attach copies of texts, if possible

7. 1. What is your library's policy in accepting deposits of official publications?

Because they
are offered

to maintain
a complete
collection

selective
general
coverage

specific
subject
coverage

☐19 (10)

☐112 (56%)

☐21 (11%)

☐18 (9%)

1 2 3 4

2. Does your library decline or forgo any deposit rights?

NO ☐115 (58%)

YES, because of
collecting level
(Question 2)

☐23 (12%)

YES, because of
storage
limitations

☐10 (5%)

1 2 3

8. 1. How far are deposits actually offered by official sources effective, in relation to your library's collecting field, in terms of:

less than
50%

50-80%

over 80%
but not
totally

totally

- a. compliance with laws
or instructions?

☐17 (9%)

☐25 (13%)

☐62 (31%)

☐17 (9%) 1 2 3 4

- b. number of official
sources known?

☐13 (7%)

☐32 (16%)

☐64 (32%)

☐10 (5%) 1 2 3 4

- c. volume of publications
known to be issued?

☐17 (9%)

☐39 (20%)

☐59 (30%)

☐7 (4%) 1 2 3 4

9. 1. If deposits are offered selectively from the full range of official publications issued:

each issuing
source?

a central
official
source?

- a. is the selection offered made by:

☐43 (21%)

☐26 (13%)

1 2

- b. What is the basis of the
selection offered?

subject
of indivi-
dual
publication

class of
publication

source of
publication

☐27 (14%)

☐18 (9%)

☐38 (19%) 1 2

- c. Please state any other basis used
(e.g. on individual or total face value)

10. 1. How does your library check deposit receipts of publications?

from published
lists and other
bibliographic
sources

against consignment
lists without
reference to
bibliographic sources

accepts what
arrives without
further check

☐ 93 (47%)

☐ 47 (24%)

☐ 34 (17%)

1 2 3

11. 1. Is there a legal or administrative obligation on your library to make deposited publications available for consultation:

a. to the general
public?

to defined
groups only?

☐ 104 (52%)

☐ 28 (14%)

1 2

b. within speci-
fied periods
only?

at all normal
opening times?

☐ 5 (3%)

☐ 117 (59%)

1 2

IV. METHODS OF COLLECTING - GIFTS (IF NOT APPLICABLE GO TO QUESTION 13)

12. 1. Does your library solicit gifts of official publications outside deposit arrangements?

NO

YES
indiscriminately

YES
selectively

a. within own jurisdiction

☐ 21 (11%)

☐ 28 (14%)

☐ 107 (54%)

1 2 3

b. from other jurisdictions
within own country

☐ 21 (11%)

☐ 11 (6%)

☐ 104 (52%)

1 2 3

2. What is your library's policy on unsolicited gifts offered?

refusal
indiscriminate
acceptance

selective
acceptance

a. within own jurisdiction

☐ 1 (1%)

☐ 45 (23%)

☐ 119 (60%)

1 2 3

b. from other jurisdictions
within own country

☐ 2 (1%)

☐ 27 (14%)

☐ 177 (59%)

1 2 3

V. METHODS OF COLLECTING - PURCHASE (QUESTIONS 13 - 16 IF NO ACQUISITION BY PURCHASE GO TO QUESTION 17)

13. 1. Does your library purchase official publications from sources within your jurisdiction?

as sole means of
acquisition

to supplement
acquisition by
deposit/gift

☐18 (9%)

☐132 (66%)

1 2

14. 1. How are official publications for purchase traced?

from published lists
and catalogues

from unpublished
lists and "contacts"

by searching
ADP data bases

☐139 (70%)

☐91 (46%)

☐12 (6%)

1 2 3

15. 1. Does your library receive any discount concession on purchase of priced official publications?

None

up to 10%

11%-25%

26%-50%

more than 50%

☐113 (57%)

☐20 (10%)

☐9 (5%)

☐6 (3%)

☐3 (2%)

1 2 3 4 5

16. 1. How do you purchase official publication?

from some or
all issuing
sources

from a central
official source

through
commercial
agents

by arrangements
with official sources
not available to the
general public

☐99 (50%)

☐62 (31%)

☐56 (28%)

☐14 (7%)

1 2 3 4

VI. MICROFORM ACQUISITION

17. 1. Does your library acquire any official publications in microform?

YES ☐101 (51%)

NO ☐94 (47%)

1 2

If your answer is NO, go to Question 18

2. If your answer is YES,

a.	what is the reason for acquisition?	publication is issued in microform only	because microforms are available	to fill gaps in collections
----	--	---	--	--------------------------------

☐ 48 (24%)

☐ 29 (15%)

☐ 48 (24%)

to save shelf space
occupied by little-
used or old publications

as additional copies
of printed publications

☐ 43 (22%)

☐ 38 (19%)

1 2 3 4 5

b.	What is the method of acquisition?	automatic or selective deposit	purchase of official microforms	purchase of commercially published microforms
----	---------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	--

☐ 39 (20%)

☐ 41 (21%)

☐ 57 (29%)

1 2 3

c.	What proportion of your collection is in microform?	less than 5%	more than 5%
----	--	--------------	--------------

☐ 81 (41%)

☐ 16 (8%)

1 2

d. Is appropriate reading equipment available on the spot?

YES ☐ 99 (50%) NO ☐

1 2

e. Can prints be supplied from microforms?

on the spot	within 2 days	after more than 2 days	not at all
-------------	------------------	---------------------------	------------

☐ 74 (37%)

☐ 9 (5%)

☐ 7 (4%)

☐ 5 (3%)

1 2 3 4

VII. GENERAL

18. 1. Do acquisitions of official publications by any means include unpublished items (eg committee reports of the legislature, internal departmental reports or studies) which the issuing source does not publish in the normal course to the general public?

YES ☐ 105 (53%)

NO ☐ 87 (44%)

1 2

2. If your answer is YES:

What proportion do these constitute of the volume of official publications collected?

up to 5%

more than 5%

83 (42%)

24 (12%)

1 2

3. please describe briefly the types of publications concerned

.....
.....

19. 1. How long after publication do you normally receive:

	within 1 week	within 2-4 weeks	within 5-8 weeks	within 9-12 weeks	after more than 12 weeks	
a. official notice of new publications?	<u>42</u> (21%)	<u>53</u> (27%)	<u>20</u> (10%)	<u>10</u> (5%)	<u>25</u> (13%)	1 2 3 4 5
b. publications received automatically under deposit arrangements	<u>39</u> (20%)	<u>67</u> (34%)	<u>28</u> (14%)	<u>11</u> (6%)	<u>17</u> (9%)	1 2 3 4 5
c. Your selections from deposit list (after ordering)	<u>11</u> (6%)	<u>35</u> (18%)	<u>11</u> (6%)	<u>4</u> (2%)	<u>6</u> (3%)	1 2 3 4 5
d. publications purchased on subscription and standing order?	<u>32</u> (16%)	<u>63</u> (32%)	<u>18</u> (9%)	<u>8</u> (4%)	<u>8</u> (4%)	1 2 3 4 5
e. How long after ordering do you normally receive publications purchased ad hoc?	<u>22</u> (11%)	<u>65</u> (33%)	<u>36</u> (18%)	<u>10</u> (5%)	<u>13</u> (7%)	1 2 3 4 5

Note: Either indicate one period in each line, covering the generality of cases or, if periods vary for different types of publications, indicate in each line minimum and maximum periods.

20. 1. What proportion of your library's total acquisitions of official publications is obtained.

by deposit?

by gift?

by purchase?

.....%

.....%

.....%

SEE SEPARATE TABLE (p.81)

21. 1. Are official publications within your jurisdiction issued in more than one language? (indicate maximum number of languages only)

a. NO in 2 languages in 3 languages in more than 3 languages

106 (53%) 46 (23%) 12 (6%) 13 (7%) 1 2 3 4

b. in bilingual or multilingual editions in separate language editions

43 (22%) 67 (34%) 1 2

2. How comprehensively does your library collect language editions where separate?

collects all separate language editions collects language editions selectively collects in one language only

45 (23%) 25 (13%) 9 (5%) 1 2 3

VIII. ACQUISITION PROBLEMS (IF NO SIGNIFICANT PROBLEMS GO TO QUESTION 23)

22. 1. Are any of the following significant problems for your library in collecting official publications?

a. General

identifying official sources tracing publications issued

49 (25%) 118 (59%) 1 2

b. Deposit

inadequate definition of:

deposit responsibilities depositing bodies terms used (eg. "published" "department") range of publications to be deposited

29 (15%) 17 (9%) 18 (9%) 44 (22%) 1 2 3 4

failure or weakness:

in compliance with deposit obligations in administrative arrangements of depositing sources

63 (32%) 55 (28%) 5 6

c. Purchase

serious
delays in
supply

inadequate
prints by
issuing
source

limitation
of funds

high prices
of official
publications

serious
postal
delays

☒ 28 (14%)

☒ 36 (18%)

☒ 30 (15%)

☐ 8 (4%)

☒ 14 (7%) 1 2 3 4 5

d. Please state briefly any other significant problems

.....
.....

SECTION B

VOLUME OF INTAKE

23. 1. By how much has your library's collection of official publications grown in the last complete year for which you can give figures?
 (Approximate if necessary)

Year	from sources within own jurisdiction	from other jurisdictions within own country	from all sources within own country (separate figures not available)	
a. number of items				1 2 3
b. increase in linear metres shelf run	metres	metres	metres	
2. Are the above figures:		factual?	estimated?	
		<u>27</u> (14%)	<u>57</u> (29%)	1 2
3. If you are unable to complete the above, please indicate the reason below:				
official publications not shelved separately	official publications shelved separately but not in measurable form (eg merged with previous years)	other reason		
<u>92</u> (46%)	<u>54</u> (27%)			1 2

24. 1. Has the annual intake of official publications into your library tended to increase or decrease over the last 3 years?

	insignificant	not more than 10% per annum	more than 10% per annum	
a. increase	<u>47</u> (24%)	<u>72</u> (39%)	<u>47</u> (24%)	1 2 3
b. decrease	<u>13</u> (6%)	<u>4</u> (2%)	<u>5</u> (3%)	1 2 3
2. What are the causes of increase or decrease? (please indicate each factor applicable)		more	less	
a. more/less publications issued		<u>118</u> (59%)	<u>8</u> (4%)	1 2
b. more/less issuing sources		<u>79</u> (40%)	<u>5</u> (3%)	1 2

c.	more/less effective identification of sources	52 (26%)	5 (3%)	1 2
d.	more/less effective tracing of publications	58 (29%)	7 (4%)	1 2
e.	more/less effective deposit arrangements	41 (21%)	6 (3%)	1 2
f.	more/less funds available	14 (7%)	11 (6%)	1 2
g.	more/less effective acquisition procedures	41 (21%)	3 (2%)	1 2
h.	change in acquisition policy, causing -	increase 25 (12%)	decrease 7 (4%)	1 2
j.	please state briefly any significant factor not covered above:			

2. With which main sources of official publications are the increases/decreases associated?

	increase	decrease	
a. the legislature	64 (32%)	4 (2%)	1 2
b. central government	114 (57%)	12 (6%)	1 2
c. sources in category iv, of the Definition of an Official Source in Appendix A to this Questionnaire	73 (37%)	9 (5%)	1 2

25.1 . Please rank the following broad sources within your jurisdiction in approximate order of

- i. the amount of official publishing which they produce
- ii. the amount of your library's official publications collection which they occupy

(insert numbers in boxes)

	1	ii	
a. central government			1 2
b. the legislature			1 2
c. sources in category iv of- that Definition 1 - 76 (38%) 2 - 26 (13%)			1 2

SECTION C

AVAILABILITY

26. 1. Is your library, or official publications collection (if separate) freely accessible

to the general public?	only to members of the public who can show a special interest?	to students and researchers of your own institution?	to students and researchers of other institutions?
------------------------	--	--	--

☐ 121 (61%)	☐ 44 (22%)	☐ 57 (29%)	☐ 49 (25%)	1 2 3 4
------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	---------

2. Does your library give borrowing privileges for official publications

to all authorised users?	to limited classes of users?	not at all
--------------------------	------------------------------	------------

a.	☐ 74 (37%)	☐ 71 (36%)	☐ 51 (26%)	1 2 3
----	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------

b. please specify

.....

-
27. 1. Has your library a specific Official Documents librarian?

a.	YES ☐ 83 (42%)	NO ☐ 113 (57%)	1 2
----	---------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-----

b. Specify qualifications required YES: 61 (31%)

-
28. 1. Is a printed guide available to enquirers about the arrangement and content of official publications collections, whether integrated or separate?

YES ☐ 61 (31%)	NO ☐ 134 (67%)	1 2
---------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-----

29. 1. If your library's official publications collection is accessible to the general public, how do you make this known?

no special measures	notices in library	notices in other local libraries	notices in guides to library services	advertisement in local media
------------------------	-----------------------	--	--	---------------------------------

89 (45%)	28 (14%)	4 (2%)	50 (25%)	5 (3%)	1 2 3 4 5
---------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------

30. 1. What proportion of official publications collections is on open shelves? - i.e. may be consulted by users without specific request.

none	up to 10%	11%-50%	51%-75%	more than 75% but less than all	all
------	-----------	---------	---------	--	-----

41 (20%)	66 (33%)	16 (8%)	8 (4%)	30 (15%)	32 (16%)	1 2 3 4 5 6
---------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	--------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-------------

2. if less than all, what is the reason for limitation?

space limitations	security considerations
-------------------	-------------------------

77 (39%)	91 (46%)	1 2
---------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-----

3. if less than 50%, what types of publications are on open shelves?

reference (eg yearbooks)	annual reports	major political, social, economic reports	statistical publications	others
-----------------------------	-------------------	---	-----------------------------	--------

a.	74 (37%)	31 (16%)	34 (17%)	52 (26%)	29 (15%)	1 2 3 4 5
----	---------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	---------------------------------------	-----------

b.

please
specify

.....
.....

5. How long does it take library users to obtain official publications not housed on open shelves?

negligible delay	up to 2 hours	2 - 4 hours	more than 4 hours but within same day	more than 1 day
---------------------	------------------	----------------	--	--------------------

127 (64%)	23 (12%)	2 (1%)	4 (2%)	6 (3%)	1 2 3 4 5
--	---------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------

31. How long after receipt by your library are official publications actually available to users for reading? (complete one box only with average figure)

within 1 day	within 3 days	within 1 week	more than 1 week	more than 2 weeks	
☐ 34 (17%)	☐ 28 (14%)	☐ 33 (17%)	☐ 23 (12%)	☐ 77 (39%)	1 2 3 4 5

2. What are the most common causes of delay in availability of current official publications to users of your library?

delays in receipt by library after publication	delays in internal processes (cat- aloguing, binding etc)	internal access procedures for publications not on open shelves	
☐ 109 (55%)	☐ 124 (62%)	☐ 11 (6%)	1 2 3

32. 1. Do you weed official publications, and if so after how long and which types of material?

	collections not weeded	collections weeded after	
		1 year 2 years 3 years at longer intervals	
a.	☐ 150 (75%)	☐ 6 (3%) ☐ 7 (4%) ☐ 3 (2%) ☐ 20 (10%)	1 2 3 4 5

- b. State briefly types of publications weeded
-
-

SECTION DINTERLENDING

33. If your library's official publication collection is within interlending arrangements within your own country please complete this Question. If not applicable, go to Question 34.

1. How effective are interlending arrangements in terms of:

a. satisfaction of your interlending requests?

less than 50%
of requests met

more than 50%
of requests met

(6%)

(44%)

1 2

b. average time taken to meet your requests (from despatch of request to receipt of publication)

within 1 week

within 2 weeks

more than
2 weeks

(21%)

(16%)

(14%)

1 2 3

2. How long does your own library take to identify and despatch an official publication interlent?

1 day

2 - 3 days

more than
3 days

(16%)

(30%)

(12%)

1 2 3

3. What are the main causes of difficulty and delay in interlending?

difficulty in
identification

incomplete
knowledge of
interlending
collections

handling
time

postal
time

(22%)

(8%)

(22%)

(20%)

1 2 3 4

SECTION E

ARRANGEMENT AND CATALOGUING

34. 1. Is your library's official publications collection separate or integrated?

wholly separate partly separate wholly integrated

[45] (23%) [67] (34%) [84] (42%) 1 2 3

2. How do you indicate this to users?

no special notices displayed notes in catalogues/
indication in library indexes

[91] (46%) [46] (23%) [27] (39%) 1 2 3

Note If Questions 35 and 36 are not applicable to your catalogue and reference system for official publications, please attach a brief statement of your system.

35. Indicate below how you incorporate official publications into your catalogue system:

1. Official publications entered in main library catalogue

a. Not at all [17] (9%) 1

by subject by title by author/
issuing
source

b. selectively by class [21] (11%) [15] (8%) [17] (9%) 1 2 3

c. selectively by item [28] (14%) [27] (14%) [35] (18%) 1 2 3

d. complete coverage [88] (44%) [89] (45%) [111] (56%) 1 2 3

2. Do you have a separate official publications catalogue?

a. NO [118] (59%) 1

by subject by title by author/
issuing source by class

b. YES [66] (33%) [25] (13%) [27] (14%) [54] (27%) [9] (5%) 1 2 3 4 5

3. Do you use lists, catalogues and indexes of issuing sources

	YES	NO	
a. as sole means of identifying and finding official publications?	☐ 38 (19%)	☐ 101 (51%)	1 2
b. to identify titles before searching library catalogues?	☐ 78 (39%)	☐ 53 (27%)	1 2
c. annotated as finding aids?	☐ 59 (30%)	☐ 65 (33%)	1 2

4. If there are any relevant to your jurisdiction, how far do you use commercially-produced catalogues/indexes to official publications?

heavily used in preference to official lists and catalogues	☐ 6 (3%)	1
used to supplement official lists and catalogues	☐ 66 (33%)	2
not used/very lightly used - official material preferred	☐ 46 (23%)	3

36. 1. Do you cross-reference official publications entered in your main library catalogue

YES ☐ 57
(37%) NO ☐ 97
(49%) 1 2

2. If YES, indicate the method:

a. Cross-references from main library catalogue

por: general cross-references by class	specific cross-references by subject	specific cross-reference by author/issuing source	specific cross-references by title	
☐ 17 (9%)	☐ 29 (15%)	☐ 49 (25%)	☐ 27 (14%)	1 2 3 4

b.

a : separate official publications catalogue	lists and catalogues of issuing sources	commercially produced lists and catalogues	enquiry point	
☐ 19 (10%)	☐ 4 (2%)	☐ 1 (1%)	☐ 11 (6%)	1 2 3 4

3. Please state briefly by what other means, if any, users obtain catalogue/index reference to the official publications collection

.....
.....

- 37 1. Do you consider your library's cataloguing and referencing of official publications adequate for the needs of users?

YES

NO

☐ 139 (68%)

☐ 54 (27%)

1 2

2. If NO, do you have current plans to improve it?

within 3 years

within 5 years

not at all

☐ 26 (13%)

☐ 16 (8%)

☐ 18 (9%)

1 2 3

SECTION F

AMOUNT AND TYPES OF USE AND USERS

38. 1. Do you record the amount of use which your official publications collection receives by consultation and/or borrowing? Complete each box applicable.

not at all	records of borrowing	records of requests for titles not on open shelves	interlending records
☐ 114 (57%)	☐ 43 (22%)	☐ 25 (13%)	☐ 31 (16%) 1 2 3 4 5
number of visitors to collection	telephone and correspondence enquires	any other records of use	
☐ 40 (20%)	☐ 31 (16%)		
			
			

39. 1. Do you record the types/purposes of users of your official publications collection?

not at all	use by the general public	academic and professional users	business and government users
☐ 146 (73%)	☐ 28 (14%)	☐ 33 (17%)	☐ 22 (11%) 1 2 3 4

40. 1. If you do not keep records of volume/type/purposes of use or users in the forms detailed in Questions 38 and 39, please state briefly any estimates or impressions you can give of the ways in which your official publications collection is used, the extent of use, and the types of users.

.....

.....

.....

YES: 101(51%)

41. 1. What categories of official publications in your collection are most heavily used? (rank in approximate order by inserting number in box eg ☒ 3)

statistics	proceedings and papers of legislature reports	major policy papers and economic/social	
☐	☐	☐	1 2 3
serial annual reports and accounts of official administrative bodies	serial reports of official research bodies	other official periodicals	general monographs
☐	☐	☐	☐
			4 5 6 7

SEE SEPARATE TABLE p.81

2. Is your ranking order based

on records kept?

on own impressions?

☒ 19 (10%)

☒ 135 (88%)

1 2

42. 1. Does your library collect publications of local authorities?

1 2 3 4

NO ☐ [43] [end questionnaire here]

(22%)

YES ☐ [143] within own jurisdiction ☐ [53] on a wider scale ☐ [69] (35%)
(72%) (27%) within the country

2. How many tiers or kinds of local authorities have significant publishing output within your jurisdiction?

less than 4

4 or more

☐ [67] (34%)

☐ [64] (32%)

1 2

3. How does your library trace publications of local authorities?

from published
lists

from unpublished
lists

by other
means

☐ [63] (32%)

☐ [20] (10%)

☐ [103] (52%)

1 2 3

4. What are the major problems in collecting publications of local authorities?

difficulties
of tracing

difficulties
in obtaining
when traced

others

☐ [111] (36%)

☐ [56] (28%)

☐ [13] (7%)

1 2 3

.....
.....
.....

5. Does your library include publications of local authorities in official publications collections which are separately shelved?

YES ☐ [55] (28%)

NO ☐ [68] (34%)

1 2

It would be helpful if you could complete the following exploratory questions about publications of intergovernmental organisations. This section is not central to the objectives of this survey but the information would be useful in assessing the desirability and possible scope of a more detailed survey in the future.

43. 1. Does your library collect publications of intergovernmental organisations ?

NO ☐ 17 [end section here]
(9%)

1 2 3 4

YES ☐ 154 from organisations based ☐ 35 on a wider scale ☐ 122 (61%)
(77%) within own jurisdiction (18%)
or country

2. Are such publications collected:

a. as deposits received from particular organisations ? ☐ 88 (44%) 1 2

b. as a result of collecting policy

for coverage
of specific organisa-
tions or groups (e.g.
The United Nations
family)?

for subject
coverage (e.g.
intergovernmental
financial organisa-
tions)?

for regional
collections ?

☐ 99 (50%)

☐ 67 (34%)

☐ 31 (16%)

1 2 3

3. Does your library

maintain a special
collection of
intergovernment
organisations
publications ?

integrate them with
a special collection
of "official publica-
tions" ?

integrate them with
the general library
collections ?

☐ 43 (22%)

☐ 46 (23%)

☐ 62 (46%)

1 2 3

4. If they are not available in the language of your own country, in what language(s) do you receive or collect the publications of intergovernmental organisations ?

specify language(s)

1 2 3

.....

SEE REPORT

Note: Further analysis necessary

5. What are the main difficulties in tracing and acquiring the publications of international organisations ?

inadequacy of
published indexes
and catalogues

difficulty in
obtaining published
lists and catalogues

lack of local
agencies for
ordering and
purchase

difficulties
with direct
ordering from
the organisa-
tions them-
selves

[58] (29%)

[56] (28%)

[37] (19%)

[56] (28%) 2 3 4

specify particular
difficulties not covered above See comment in report

1 2

YES: 2(1%)

6. Are collections of international organisations' publications

specially
catalogued or
indexed ?

catalogued or
indexed in same
way as other official
publications ?

available to
users on the
same basis as
other official
publications ?

[20] (10%)

[102] (51%)

[117] (59%)

1 2 3

7. Does your library utilise information, indexing and retrieval systems of intergovernmental agencies - e.g. AGRIS, ISIS.

NO [136] (68%)

YES [16] (8%)

specific systems used See comment in
...report.....
.....

1 2

8. For your purposes what major improvements would you like to see in the availability of intergovernmental organisations' documents ? :

..... See comment in report
.....
.....

'OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS' and 'OFFICIAL SOURCE'

1. For purposes of this survey please work as closely as possible to the following :

a. "Official Publication"

An official publication is a record in any form prepared by or for an official source, circulated beyond that source to limited groups or to individuals other than those advising or negotiating with it, or to the general public.

b. "Official Source"

An official source is any organisation within a particular jurisdiction which is

- i. a part of the legislative, executive or judicial machinery of central government; or
 - ii. an integral part of, or directly and entirely maintained by, a department of central government; or
 - iii. established or funded, wholly or substantially, and directly, by any part of the machinery of central government within the particular jurisdiction, and is formally accountable to, reports to, or is otherwise controlled by an organ of government; or
 - iv. though not within categories i. to iii. above, is a publisher of material regarded by librarians as official, in the sense that its publications carry an authority or have a status in public affairs equivalent to publications from sources within the terms of categories i to iii. This category will often include such sources as public utilities and corporations set up under statute or equivalent device, some of whose publications are official in the full sense, as published through the machinery of government for parliamentary or administrative purposes, while others are published for purposes which are not regarded as official in a governmental sense. e.g. programme material published by broadcasting authorities organised as public bodies; consumer advice or promotion material issued by public utilities similarly organised.
- c. There are no internationally uniform practices about the publications of bodies falling within category iv. An indication of the status of their publications is sometimes to be found in their practices in relation to deposit. For the purposes of this survey if a source is regarded as official within the jurisdiction to which the questionnaire relates, all its publications should be regarded as originating from an official source. If, however, distinctions are made by libraries in their collecting policies between different types of publications issuing from the same source, answers to relevant questions should be suitably annotated. A supplementary note specifying the general practice of the responding library should be added for clarification, if necessary.
- d. Judicial publications are not separately categorised, as their origin within legal systems and their classification as official publications varies from country to country. They are included within category i., as appropriate, and any special position should be clarified in a supplementary note.

- e. In the light of the differences between government systems and in the interests of producing information from this survey on a common basis, the following reservations apply, notwithstanding the status of the originating sources in relation to the above definitions:
- i. purely educational bodies, such as universities, schools and other institutions of learning are not included as official sources;
 - ii. libraries, museums, galleries and similar institutions are included only if they fall within the definitions;
 - iii. maps and hydrographic and other charts are not included unless they accompany publications as part of them;
 - iv. patent specifications and associated material not normally collected except by highly specialised libraries are not included;
 - v. publications of political parties are not included.

DEFINITIONS AND BASES OF MEASUREMENT

2. VOLUME OF ACQUISITION

As a broad measurement of the volume of official publications held or acquired during a particular period, this survey uses a measurement of linear metres as a suitable common indicator for print forms of publishing. This International Library Statistics Standard was adopted by UNESCO in 1970. (Recommendation concerning the international standardisation of library statistics, Unesco, 1970).

3. LEVELS OF COLLECTING

<u>Exhaustive</u>	attempts to collect all available official publications
<u>Comprehensive</u>	attempts to collect all major titles of the available official publications
<u>Selective</u>	attempts to collect all official publications in specific subjects
<u>Highly Selective</u>	attempts to collect only selected official titles in specified subjects or from selected sources.

MEASUREMENTS OF USE

Statistics of the use made of official publications collections are particularly difficult to obtain and compare, as libraries keep such figures on many different bases, or may not keep such measurements at all. If questions in this section cannot be answered in the terms requested, please supply whatever relevant figures may be available, clearly stating their basis. If no actual measurements are available estimates and subjective impressions will be helpful, provided their nature is clearly stated.

This will all help to form a reasonable, even if not complete picture of the actual use made - an important area of the survey - of official publications collections.

RESULTS OF QUESTIONS 20.1 AND 41.1

Q. 20.1. METHODS OF ACQUISITION

Method	Proportion of Collection Obtained							
	0 - 24%		25 - 49%		50 - 74%		75 - 100%	
	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>
Deposit	3	2	6	3	28	14	105	53
Gift	107	54	21	11	10	5	23	12
Purchase	96	48	12	6	11	6	27	14

Q. 41.1. TYPES OF MATERIAL USED

		<u>No.</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Ranking Order from Replies</u>
First choice	Statistics	63	32	1
	Legislative proceedings	37	19	3
	Major policy papers	22	11	2
	Annual reports	15	8	4
	Research results	4	2	5
	Other periodicals	7	4	6
	General monographs	3	2	7

ANALYSIS OF REPLIES TO QUESTIONNAIRE - BY GEOGRAPHICAL AREA *

Key

- 01 = Europe
- 02 = North America
- 03 = South America and Caribbean
- 04 = Africa
- [05 = Middle East]
- 06 = Australasia/Oceania
- 07 = Asia and Far East

* (see note p. 12)

ANALYSIS OF REPLIES TO QUESTIONNAIRE: BY GEOGRAPHICAL AREA

	TOTAL (196)	01 Europe (78)	02 North America (37)	03 South America/ Caribbean (18)	04 Africa (24)	06 Australasia/ Oceania (23)	07 Asia/ Far East (16)
1.1. How long has your library collected official publications ?							
- less than 10 years	15 (8%)	4 (5%)	1 (3%)	3 (17%)	4 (17%)	- -	3 (19%)
- 11-20 years	34 (18%)	5 (6%)	5 (14%)	4 (22%)	9 (38%)	7 (30%)	2 (13%)
- over 20 years	147 (74%)	68 (87%)	30 (81%)	10 (56%)	11 (46%)	16 (70%)	11 (69%)
1.2. Has acquisition of official publications been continuous over that period ?							
- Yes	183 (92%)	72 (92%)	34 (91%)	17 (94%)	21 (88%)	22 (96%)	15 (94%)
- No	15 (8%)	5 (6%)	3 (8%)	1 (6%)	3 (13%)	1 (4%)	1 (6%)
1.3. Are there significant gaps in the collection ?							
- Yes	73 (37%)	31 (39%)	6 (16%)	12 (67%)	10 (42%)	7 (30%)	5 (31%)
- in subject continuity	34 (17%)	15 (19%)	4 (11%)	4 (22%)	5 (21%)	4 (17%)	2 (13%)
- in period continuity	65 (33%)	26 (33%)	7 (19%)	12 (67%)	9 (38%)	3 (13%)	5 (31%)
- in continuity of sources	47 (24%)	17 (21%)	8 (22%)	5 (28%)	7 (29%)	4 (17%)	4 (25%)
- no	101 (51%)	39 (50%)	23 (62%)	4 (22%)	9 (38%)	15 (65%)	10 (63%)

Notes:

- (1) Category 05 (Middle East) has been omitted as there were too few valid replies to provide useful data.
- (2) Any apparent discrepancies between the figures given in the TOTAL column and the totals obtained by adding up the figures in the separate columns are accounted for by this.
- (3) Percentages are given as percentages of the number of respondents in each area.

	TOTAL (196)	01 Europe (78)	02 North America (37)	03 South America/ Caribbean (18)	04 Africa (24)	06 Australasia/ Oceania (23)	07 Asia/ Far East (16)
1.4. If your answer is Yes, what are the causes ?							
- changes in library acquisition policy	37 (19%)	18 (23%)	6 (16%)	6 (33%)	3 (13%)	4 (17%)	1 (6%)
- changes in basis of deposit	22 (11%)	7 (9%)	5 (14%)	2 (11%)	2 (8%)	4 (17%)	2 (13%)
- weeding of collection	10 (5%)	6 (8%)	1 (3%)	2 (11%)	-	-	1 (6%)
- accidental loss or destruction	32 (16%)	13 (17%)	1 (3%)	4 (22%)	8 (33%)	1 (4%)	4 (25%)
2.1. How would you describe your library's level of collection of official publications in the terms stated in App.A, para. 3 ?							
- highly selective	21 (11%)	9 (11%)	2 (5%)	1 (6%)	2 (8%)	1 (4%)	5 (31%)
- selective	29 (15%)	16 (21%)	4 (11%)	1 (6%)	2 (8%)	3 (13%)	3 (19%)
- comprehensive	71 (36%)	30 (38%)	15 (41%)	8 (44%)	5 (21%)	10 (43%)	3 (19%)
- exhaustive	75 (38%)	22 (28%)	17 (46%)	7 (39%)	15 (62%)	9 (39%)	5 (31%)
3.1. What estimated proportion does your library attempt to collect of official publications from the sources covered by the Definition of an Official Source at App. A ?							
(a) categories i-iii							
- up to 50%	34 (17%)	16 (21%)	4 (11%)	1 (6%)	3 (13%)	3 (13%)	6 (38%)
- more than 50% but not all	64 (32%)	28 (35%)	14 (38%)	6 (33%)	5 (21%)	8 (33%)	3 (19%)
- all	89 (45%)	29 (37%)	17 (46%)	9 (50%)	14 (58%)	12 (52%)	6 (38%)
(b) category (iv)							
- up to 50%	60 (30%)	29 (37%)	12 (32%)	3 (17%)	3 (13%)	4 (17%)	6 (50%)
- more than 50% but not all	48 (24%)	19 (24%)	12 (32%)	5 (28%)	2 (8%)	8 (35%)	2 (13%)
- all	59 (30%)	18 (23%)	10 (27%)	5 (28%)	13 (54%)	8 (35%)	4 (25%)
3.2. How far do you achieve these objective ?							
(a) categories i-iii							
- less than 50%	30 (15%)	11 (14%)	3 (8%)	3 (17%)	3 (13%)	5 (22%)	4 (25%)

	TOTAL (196)	01 Europe (78)	02 North America (37)	03 South America/ Caribbean (18)	04 Africa (24)	06 Australasia/ Oceania (23)	07 Asia/ Far East (16)
- 50%-75%	38 (19%)	14 (18%)	3 (8%)	10 (51%)	7 (29%)	- -	4 (25%)
- more than 75% but not totally	92 (46%)	34 (44%)	25 (68%)	4 (22%)	5 (21%)	14 (61%)	6 (38%)
- totally	26 (13%)	14 (18%)	4 (11%)	- -	5 (21%)	4 (17%)	1 (6%)
(b) category (iv)							
- less than 50%	50 (25%)	21 (26%)	7 (19%)	5 (28%)	6 (25%)	5 (22%)	6 (38%)
- 50% - 75%	36 (18%)	18 (23%)	6 (16%)	6 (33%)	2 (8%)	2 (9%)	2 (13%)
- more than 75% but not totally	65 (33%)	21 (26%)	16 (43%)	2 (11%)	6 (25%)	12 (52%)	6 (38%)
- totally	13 (7%)	7 (9%)	4 (11%)	- -	2 (8%)	- -	- -
4.1. Does your library receive deposits of official publica- tions from sources within your jurisdiction							
(a) by legal right ?							
- full deposits	66 (33%)	30 (39%)	9 (24%)	5 (28%)	14 (58%)	4 (17%)	4 (25%)
- selective deposits	11 (6%)	5 (7%)	5 (14%)	- -	- -	- -	1 (6%)
- no deposits	18 (9%)	6 (8%)	4 (11%)	2 (11%)	- -	3 (13%)	2 (13%)
or							
(b) by administrative instruction							
- full deposits	35 (18%)	10 (13%)	13 (37%)	- -	5 (21%)	6 (26%)	1 (6%)
- selective deposits	18 (9%)	3 (4%)	6 (16%)	- -	1 (4%)	6 (26%)	2 (13%)
- no deposits	13 (7%)	6 (8%)	1 (3%)	2 (11%)	- -	2 (9%)	2 (13%)
or							
(c) on both bases, depending on the type of source ?							
- full deposits	4 (7%)	7 (9%)	2 (5%)	- -	2 (8%)	3 (13%)	- -
- selective deposits	3 (2%)	- -	2 (5%)	- -	1 (4%)	- -	- -
- no deposits	16 (8%)	6 (8%)	3 (8%)	2 (11%)	- -	3 (13%)	2 (13%)
or							
(d) by custom or working agreement as the only basis of deposit ?							
- full deposits	6 (3%)	1 (1%)	- -	3 (17%)	- -	- -	1 (6%)

	TOTAL (196)	01 Europe (78)	02 North America (37)	03 South America/ Caribbean (18)	04 Africa (24)	06 Australasia/ Oceania (23)	07 Asia/ Far East (16)
- selective deposits	19 (10%)	5 (7%)	5 (14%)	2 (11%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	4 (25%)
- no deposits	16 (8%)	6 (8%)	3 (8%)	3 (17%)	- -	3 (13%)	1 (6%)
4.2. Does your library receive deposits from official sources from other jurisdictions within your country, on any basis ?							
(a) Yes	97 (49%)	33 (42%)	25 (68%)	4 (22%)	15 (62%)	12 (52%)	7 (44%)
- full deposits	41 (21%)	15 (19%)	12 (32%)	2 (11%)	5 (21%)	5 (22%)	2 (13%)
- selective deposits	43 (22%)	11 (14%)	12 (32%)	1 (6%)	7 (30%)	7 (30%)	4 (25%)
(b) No	- -	17 (22%)	5 (14%)	6 (33%)	3 (13%)	9 (39%)	4 (25%)
5.1. How far does law or administrative instruction cover the range of official sources within your jurisdiction as defined in App.A to this questionnaire ?							
- under 50%	14 (7%)	4 (5%)	2 (5%)	2 (11%)	- -	1 (4%)	4 (25%)
- 50% - 80%	38 (19%)	6 (8%)	15 (41%)	4 (22%)	4 (17%)	6 (26%)	3 (19%)
- over 80%	89 (45%)	38 (49%)	15 (41%)	5 (28%)	14 (58%)	11 (48%)	5 (31%)
6.1. Do deposit laws or administrative instructions or other legal or official documents define, describe or list the following :							
(a) 'publications'							
- Yes	92 (46%)	31 (40%)	25 (68%)	5 (28%)	13 (54%)	10 (44%)	8 (50%)
- No	32 (16%)	16 (21%)	2 (5%)	4 (22%)	3 (13%)	6 (26%)	- -
(b) 'official'							
- Yes	50 (25%)	20 (26%)	9 (24%)	2 (11%)	8 (33%)	4 (17%)	7 (44%)
- No	60 (30%)	24 (31%)	16 (43%)	5 (28%)	4 (17%)	9 (39%)	1 (6%)

(c) 'government'

- Yes

- No

(d) government departments

- Yes

- No

(a) the range of publications to be deposited

- Yes

- No

(f) the sources obliged to deposit

- Yes

- No

(g) the libraries entitled to receive deposits

- Yes

- No

7.1. What is your library's policy in accepting deposits of official publications ?

- because they are offered

- to maintain a complete collection

- selective general coverage

- specific subject coverage

7.2. Does your library decline or forgo any deposit rights ?

- No

- Yes, because of collecting level

- Yes, because of storage limitations

TOTAL (196)	01 Europe (78)	02 North America (37)	03 South America/ Caribbean (18)	04 Africa (24)	06 Australasia/ Oceania (23)	07 Asia/ Far East (16)
51 (26%)	18 (23%)	12 (32%)	2 (11%)	8 (33%)	4 (17%)	6 (38%)
60 (30%)	24 (31%)	15 (41%)	5 (28%)	4 (17%)	9 (39%)	2 (13%)
53 (27%)	15 (19%)	20 (54%)	2 (11%)	7 (29%)	14 (61%)	5 (31%)
55 (28%)	24 (31%)	6 (16%)	5 (28%)	5 (21%)	9 (39%)	3 (19%)
94 (47%)	30 (39%)	25 (68%)	3 (17%)	14 (58%)	15 (65%)	7 (44%)
20 (10%)	11 (14%)	2 (5%)	5 (28%)	1 (4%)	-	-
81 (41%)	31 (40%)	20 (54%)	4 (22%)	13 (54%)	9 (39%)	5 (31%)
34 (17%)	13 (17%)	5 (14%)	5 (28%)	2 (8%)	5 (22%)	2 (13%)
102 (51%)	40 (51%)	22 (59%)	5 (28%)	13 (54%)	15 (65%)	5 (31%)
17 (9%)	6 (8%)	2 (5%)	3 (17%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	3 (19%)
19 (10%)	8 (10%)	2 (5%)	2 (11%)	1 (4%)	3 (13%)	2 (13%)
112 (56%)	35 (45%)	30 (81%)	8 (44%)	16 (67%)	16 (70%)	6 (38%)
21 (11%)	9 (11%)	5 (14%)	2 (11%)	2 (8%)	1 (4%)	2 (13%)
18 (9%)	7 (9%)	3 (8%)	1 (6%)	3 (13%)	-	4 (25%)
115 (58%)	39 (50%)	22 (59%)	9 (50%)	18 (75%)	19 (83%)	8 (50%)
23 (12%)	9 (11%)	8 (22%)	1 (6%)	1 (4%)	-	2 (13%)
10 (5%)	2 (3%)	-	3 (17%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	1 (6%)

8.1. How far are deposits actually offered by official sources effective, in terms of :

(a) compliance with laws or instructions ?

- less than 50%
- 50% - 80%
- over 80% but not totally
- totally

17 (9%)	4 (5%)	3 (8%)	3 (17%)	3 (13%)	2 (9%)	2 (13%)
25 (13%)	8 (10%)	5 (14%)	1 (6%)	6 (25%)	4 (17%)	1 (6%)
62 (31)	21 (27%)	18 (49%)	3 (17%)	5 (21%)	10 (44%)	4 (25%)
17 (9%)	6 (8%)	3 (8%)	-	4 (17%)	3 (13%)	1 (6%)

(b) number of official sources known ?

- less than 50%
- 50% - 80%
- over 80% but not totally
- totally

13 (7%)	4 (5%)	-	4 (22%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	3 (19%)
32 (16%)	8 (10%)	9 (24%)	3 (17%)	5 (21%)	5 (22%)	2 (13%)
64 (32%)	20 (26%)	20 (54%)	3 (17%)	6 (25%)	10 (44%)	4 (25%)
10 (5%)	4 (5%)	1 (3%)	-	2 (8%)	2 (9%)	1 (6%)

(c) volume of publications known to be issued ?

- less than 50%
- 50% - 80%
- over 80% but not totally
- totally

17 (9%)	3 (4%)	3 (8%)	3 (17%)	2 (8%)	2 (9%)	3 (19%)
39 (20%)	8 (10%)	12 (32%)	6 (33%)	4 (17%)	6 (26%)	3 (19%)
59 (30%)	21 (27%)	18 (49%)	1 (6%)	6 (25%)	9 (39%)	3 (19%)
7 (4%)	3 (4%)	-	-	2 (8%)	1 (4%)	1 (6%)

9.1. If deposits are offered selectively from the full range of official publications issued :

(a) is the selection offered made by

- each issuing source ?
- a central official source ?

43 (22%)	18 (23%)	9 (24%)	2 (11%)	6 (25%)	2 (9%)	4 (25%)
26 (13%)	4 (5%)	15 (41%)	-	-	7 (30%)	-

(b) what is the basis of the selection offered :

- subject of individual

	TOTAL (196)	01 Europe (78)	02 North America (37)	03 South America/ Caribbean (18)	04 Africa (24)	06 Australasia/ Oceania (23)	07 Asia/ Far East (16)
publication ?	27 (14%)	13 (17%)	8 (22%)	- -	2 (8%)	2 (9%)	1 (6%)
- class of publication ?	18 (9%)	4 (5%)	8 (22%)	1 (6%)	3 (13%)	- -	1 (6%)
- source of publication ?	32 (16%)	10 (13%)	9 (24%)	3 (17%)	4 (17%)	5 (22%)	2 (13%)
10.1. How does your library check deposit receipts of publica- tions ?							
- from published lists and other bibliographic sources	93 (47%)	30 (39%)	23 (62%)	8 (44%)	13 (54%)	9 (39%)	8 (50%)
- against consignment lists without reference to bibliographic sources	47 (24%)	14 (18%)	15 (41%)	3 (17%)	3 (13%)	9 (39%)	3 (19%)
- accepts what arrives with- out further check	34 (17%)	16 (21%)	8 (22%)	3 (17%)	3 (13%)	2 (9%)	1 (6%)
11.1. Is there a legal or admini- strative obligation on your library to make deposited publications available for consultation :							
(a) to the general public ?							
- Yes	104 (52%)	29 (37%)	27 (73%)	12 (67%)	16 (67%)	14 (61%)	5 (31%)
(b) to defined groups only	28 (14%)	17 (22%)	1 (3%)	1 (6%)	2 (8%)	3 (13%)	4 (25%)
(c) within specified periods only ?	5 (3%)	- -	2 (5%)	- -	2 (8%)	1 (4%)	- -
(d) at all normal opening time ?	118 (59%)	41 (53%)	26 (70%)	9 (50%)	15 (62%)	15 (65%)	9 (56%)
12.1. Does your library solicit gifts of official publica- tions outside deposit arrangement ?							
(a) within own jurisdiction							
- No	21 (11%)	12 (15%)	1 (3%)	1 (6%)	4 (17%)	2 (9%)	- -
- Yes, indiscriminately	28 (14%)	8 (10%)	5 (14%)	6 (33%)	2 (8%)	3 (13%)	3 (19%)
- Yes, selectively	107 (54%)	36 (46%)	27 (73%)	10 (56%)	10 (42%)	14 (61%)	10 (63%)

	TOTAL (196)	01 Europe (78)	02 North America (37)	03 South America/ Caribbean (18)	04 Africa (24)	06 Australasia/ Oceania (23)	07 Asia/ Far East (16)
(b) from other jurisdictions within own country							
- No	21 (11%)	10 (13%)	1 (3%)	1 (6%)	4 (17%)	2 (9%)	1 (6%)
- Yes, indiscriminately	11 (6%)	3 (4%)	2 (5%)	3 (17%)	2 (8%)	1 (4%)	1 (6%)
- Yes, selectively	104 (52%)	34 (44%)	29 (78%)	16 (89%)	8 (33%)	13 (57%)	7 (44%)
12.2. What is your library's policy on unsolicited gifts offered?							
(a) within own jurisdiction							
- refusal	1 (1%)	1 (1%)	-	-	-	-	-
- indiscriminate acceptance	45 (23%)	11 (14%)	7 (19%)	7 (39%)	11 (46%)	5 (22%)	3 (19%)
- selective acceptance	119 (60%)	46 (59%)	30 (81%)	11 (61%)	6 (25%)	14 (61%)	10 (63%)
(b) from other jurisdictions within own country							
- refusal	2 (1%)	2 (3%)	-	-	-	-	-
- indiscriminate acceptance	27 (14%)	7 (9%)	4 (11%)	5 (28%)	7 (29%)	1 (4%)	2 (13%)
- selective acceptance	117 (59%)	45 (58%)	30 (81%)	11 (61%)	7 (29%)	15 (65%)	7 (44%)
13.1. Does your library purchase official publications from sources within your jurisdiction ?							
- as sole means of acquisition	18 (9%)	14 (18%)	1 (3%)	-	2 (8%)	1 (4%)	-
- to supplement acquisition by deposit/gift	132 (66%)	43 (55%)	33 (89%)	15 (83%)	11 (46%)	20 (87%)	10 (63%)
14.1. How are official publications for purchase traced ?							
- from published lists and catalogues	139 (70%)	54 (69%)	32 (86%)	12 (67%)	11 (46%)	19 (82%)	9 (56%)
- from unpublished lists and 'contacts'	91 (46%)	24 (31%)	25 (68%)	12 (67%)	9 (38%)	14 (61%)	6 (38%)
- by searching ADP data bases	12 (6%)	3 (4%)	7 (19%)	-	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	-
15.1. Does your library receive any discount concession on purchase of priced official publications ?							

	TOTAL (196)	01 Europe (78)	02 North America (37)	03 South America/ Caribbean (18)	04 Africa (24)	06 Australasia/ Oceania (23)	07 Asia/ Far East (16)
- None	113 (57%)	41 (53%)	31 (84%)	8 (44%)	12 (50%)	14 (61%)	6 (38%)
- up to 10%	20 (10%)	7 (9%)	1 (3%)	4 (22%)	-	5 (22%)	2 (13%)
- 11% - 25%	9 (5%)	4 (5%)	1 (3%)	1 (6%)	1 (4%)	-	2 (13%)
- 26% - 50%	6 (3%)	6 (8%)	-	-	-	-	-
- more than 50%	3 (2%)	1 (1%)	1 (3%)	-	-	-	-
16.1. How do you purchase official publications ?							
- from some or all issuing sources	99 (50%)	32 (41%)	27 (73%)	7 (39%)	10 (42%)	15 (65%)	6 (38%)
- from a central official source	62 (31%)	22 (28%)	13 (35%)	4 (22%)	4 (17%)	12 (52%)	6 (38%)
- through commercial agents	56 (28%)	24 (31%)	16 (43%)	2 (11%)	4 (17%)	3 (13%)	6 (38%)
- by arrangements with official sources not available to the general public	14 (7%)	6 (8%)	3 (8%)	1 (6%)	1 (4%)	-	3 (19%)
17.1. Does your library acquire any official publications in microform ?							
- Yes	101 (51%)	38 (49%)	33 (95%)	12 (67%)	4 (17%)	18 (78%)	3 (19%)
- No	94 (47%)	37 (47%)	1 (3%)	16 (88%)	20 (83%)	4 (17%)	13 (81%)
17.2. If your answer is Yes:							
(a) what is the reason for acquisition ?							
- publication is issued in microform only	48 (24%)	5 (6%)	18 (49%)	-	1 (4%)	12 (52%)	1 (6%)
- because microforms are available	29 (15%)	11 (14%)	7 (19%)	-	2 (8%)	9 (39%)	-
- to fill gaps in collection	48 (24%)	14 (18%)	21 (57%)	-	1 (4%)	9 (39%)	3 (19%)
- to save shelf-space occupied by little-used or old publications	43 (22%)	18 (23%)	20 (54%)	-	-	4 (17%)	1 (6%)
- as additional copies of printed publications	38 (19%)	16 (21%)	15 (41%)	-	1 (4%)	5 (22%)	1 (6%)
(b) what is the method of acquisition ?							

	TOTAL (196)	01 Europe (78)	02 North America (37)	03 South America/ Caribbean (18)	04 Africa (24)	06 Australasia/ Oceania (23)	07 Asia/ Far East (16)
- automatic or selective deposit	39 (20%)	12 (15%)	13 (35%)	- -	1 (4%)	13 (57%)	- -
- purchase of official microforms	41 (21%)	18 (23%)	14 (38%)	- -	3 (13%)	4 (17%)	1 (6%)
- purchase of commercially published microforms	57 (29%)	15 (19%)	31 (84%)	- -	1 (4%)	6 (26%)	2 (13%)
(c) what proportion of your collection is in microform?							
- less than 5%	81 (41%)	32 (41%)	24 (65%)	1 (6%)	3 (13%)	17 (74%)	3 (19%)
- more than 5%	16 (8%)	4 (5%)	11 (30%)	- -	1 (4%)	- -	- -
(d) is appropriate reading equipment available on the spot ?							
- Yes	99 (50%)	37 (47%)	35 (95%)	1 (6%)	4 (17%)	18 (78%)	3 (19%)
- No	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
(e) can prints be supplied from microforms ?							
- on the spot	74 (37%)	22 (28%)	29 (78%)	- -	3 (13%)	16 (70%)	2 (13%)
- within 2 days	9 (5%)	5 (6%)	3 (8%)	- -	- -	1 (4%)	- -
- after more than 2 days	7 (4%)	4 (5%)	1 (3%)	- -	- -	1 (4%)	- -
- not at all	5 (3%)	3 (4%)	1 (3%)	- -	1 (4%)	- -	- -
18.1. Do acquisitions of official publications (by any means) include unpublished items (e.g. committee reports of the legislature, internal departmental reports or studies) which the issuing source does not publish in the normal course of events to the general public ?							
- Yes	105 (53%)	36 (46%)	28 (76%)	7 (39%)	17 (71%)	12 (52%)	5 (31%)
- No	87 (44%)	38 (50%)	8 (22%)	10 (56%)	7 (29%)	10 (43%)	11 (69%)
18.2. If your answer is Yes:							

	TOTAL (196)	01 Europe (78)	02 North America (37)	03 South America/ Caribbean (18)	04 Africa (24)	06 Australasia/ Oceania (23)	07 Asia/ Far East (16)
What proportion do these constitute of the volume of official publications collected?							
- up to 5%	83 (42%)	26 (33%)	26 (70%)	6 (33%)	11 (46%)	10 (43%)	4 (25%)
- more than 5%	24 (12%)	11 (14%)	3 (8%)	1 (6%)	6 (25%)	2 (9%)	1 (6%)
19.1. How long after publication do you normally receive :							
(a) official notice of new publications ?							
- within 1 week	42 (21%)	29 (37%)	6 (16%)	1 (6%)	2 (8%)	1 (4%)	3 (19%)
- within 2-4 weeks	53 (27%)	15 (19%)	14 (38%)	3 (17%)	4 (17%)	10 (43%)	5 (31%)
- within 5-8 weeks	20 (10%)	8 (10%)	3 (8%)	1 (6%)	3 (13%)	3 (13%)	2 (13%)
- within 9-12 weeks	10 (5%)	1 (1%)	6 (16%)	-	2 (8%)	-	1 (6%)
- after more than 12 weeks	25 (13%)	12 (15%)	3 (8%)	3 (17%)	4 (17%)	1 (4%)	1 (6%)
(b) publications received automatically under deposit arrangements ?							
- within 1 week	39 (20%)	21 (27%)	10 (27%)	-	4 (17%)	2 (9%)	1 (6%)
- within 2-4 weeks	67 (34%)	18 (23%)	20 (54%)	3 (17%)	10 (42%)	10 (43%)	4 (25%)
- within 5-8 weeks	27 (14%)	8 (10%)	5 (14%)	1 (6%)	5 (21%)	5 (22%)	4 (25%)
- within 9-12 weeks	11 (6%)	5 (6%)	2 (5%)	1 (6%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	1 (6%)
- after more than 12 weeks	17 (9%)	10 (13%)	1 (3%)	-	3 (13%)	2 (9%)	1 (6%)
(c) your selections from deposit list (after order- ing)							
- within 1 week	11 (6%)	6 (8%)	2 (5%)	-	2 (8%)	-	1 (6%)
- within 2-4 weeks	35 (18%)	11 (14%)	11 (30%)	3 (17%)	2 (8%)	1 (4%)	4 (25%)
- within 5-8 weeks	11 (6%)	2 (3%)	3 (8%)	-	2 (8%)	4 (17%)	1 (6%)
- within 9-12 weeks	4 (2%)	1 (1%)	2 (5%)	-	-	1 (4%)	-
- after more than 12 weeks	6 (3%)	2 (3%)	1 (3%)	1 (6%)	2 (8%)	-	-
(d) publications purchased on subscription and standing order ?							
- within 1 week	32 (16%)	22 (28%)	4 (11%)	-	3 (13%)	1 (4%)	1 (6%)
- within 2-4 weeks	63 (32%)	24 (31%)	13 (35%)	5 (28%)	7 (29%)	8 (35%)	3 (19%)

22.1. Are any of the following significant problems for your library in collecting official publications :

(a) general

- identifying official sources
- tracing publications issued

(b) inadequate definition of

- deposit responsibilities
- depositing bodies
- terms used (e.g. 'published', 'department')
- range of publications to be deposited

(c) failure or weakness

- in compliance with deposit obligations
- in administrative arrangements of depositing sources

(d) purchase :

- serious delays in supply
- inadequate prints by issuing sources
- limitation of funds
- high prices of official publications
- serious postal delays

23.1. By how much has your library's collection of official publications grown in the last complete year for which you can give figures ?

TOTAL (196)	01 Europe (78)	02 North America (37)	03 South America/ Caribbean (18)	04 Africa (24)	06 Australasia/ Oceania (23)	07 Asia/ Far East (16)
49 (25%)	18 (23%)	9 (24%)	3 (17%)	6 (25%)	9 (39%)	3 (19%)
118 (59%)	38 (49%)	28 (76%)	17 (94%)	16 (67%)	11 (48%)	8 (50%)
29 (15%)	8 (10%)	5 (14%)	5 (28%)	-	6 (26%)	-
17 (9%)	7 (9%)	3 (8%)	3 (17%)	-	3 (13%)	-
18 (9%)	5 (6%)	2 (5%)	4 (22%)	-	5 (22%)	1 (6%)
44 (22%)	13 (17%)	11 (30%)	6 (33%)	-	9 (39%)	3 (19%)
63 (32%)	18 (23%)	16 (43%)	12 (67%)	-	6 (26%)	4 (25%)
55 (28%)	11 (14%)	17 (46%)	8 (44%)	-	6 (26%)	6 (38%)
28 (14%)	10 (13%)	6 (16%)	3 (17%)	-	3 (13%)	3 (19%)
36 (18%)	13 (17%)	11 (30%)	3 (17%)	-	6 (26%)	1 (6%)
30 (15%)	8 (10%)	7 (19%)	7 (39%)	-	4 (17%)	3 (19%)
8 (4%)	5 (6%)	2 (5%)	1 (6%)	-	-	-
14 (7%)	4 (5%)	1 (3%)	4 (22%)	-	1 (4%)	-
[Data not	separately	analysed.	See comment in	report]		

	TOTAL (196)	01 Europe (78)	02 North America (37)	03 South America/ Caribbean (18)	04 Africa (24)	06 Australasia/ Oceania (23)	07 Asia/ Far East (16)
- within 5-8 weeks	18 (9%)	4 (5%)	7 (19%)	1 (6%)	-	3 (13%)	3 (19%)
- within 9-12 weeks	8 (4%)	-	4 (11%)	1 (6%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	1 (6%)
- after more than 12 weeks	8 (4%)	4 (5%)	-	1 (6%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	1 (6%)
(e) publications purchased ad hoc ?							
- within 1 week	22 (11%)	11 (14%)	4 (11%)	1 (6%)	2 (8%)	2 (9%)	2 (13%)
- within 2-4 weeks	65 (33%)	31 (40%)	12 (32%)	3 (17%)	8 (33%)	5 (22%)	4 (25%)
- within 5-8 weeks	36 (18%)	10 (13%)	14 (38%)	4 (22%)	1 (4%)	5 (22%)	2 (13%)
- within 9-12 weeks	10 (5%)	3 (4%)	3 (8%)	-	1 (4%)	3 (13%)	-
- after more than 12 weeks	13 (7%)	5 (6%)	3 (8%)	2 (11%)	2 (8%)	1 (4%)	-
[20.1. Not separately analysed.	See	Table 7]					
21.1. Are official publications within your jurisdiction issued in more than one language ?							
(a) No	106 (53%)	47 (60%)	15 (41%)	15 (83%)	7 (29%)	14 (61%)	6 (38%)
(b) in 2 languages	46 (23%)	15 (19%)	14 (38%)	1 (6%)	9 (38%)	-	5 (31%)
(c) in 3 languages	12 (6%)	6 (8%)	2 (5%)	1 (6%)	2 (8%)	-	1 (6%)
(d) in more than 3 languages	13 (7%)	5 (6%)	1 (3%)	1 (6%)	2 (8%)	2 (9%)	2 (13%)
(e) in bilingual or multilingual editions	43 (22%)	14 (18%)	14 (38%)	2 (11%)	3 (13%)	2 (9%)	6 (38%)
(f) in separate language editions	3 (2%)	18 (23%)	22 (59%)	2 (11%)	13 (54%)	8 (35%)	4 (25%)
21.2. How comprehensively does your library collect language editions where separate ?							
- collects all separate language editions	45 (23%)	18 (23%)	8 (22%)	10 (56%)	1 (4%)	5 (22%)	1 (6%)
- collects language editions selectively	25 (13%)	2 (3%)	9 (24%)	3 (17%)	2 (8%)	1 (4%)	7 (44%)
- collects in one language only	9 (5%)	4 (5%)	3 (8%)	1 (6%)	-	1 (4%)	-

23.2. Are the above figures

- factual ?
- estimated ?

23.3. If you are unable to complete the above, please indicate the reason :

- official publications not shelved separately
- official publications shelved separately but not in measurable form

24.1. Has the annual intake of official publications into your library tended to increase or decrease over the last 3 years?

(a) increase

- insignificant
- not more than 10% per year
- more than 10% per year

(b) decrease

- insignificant
- not more than 10% per year
- more than 10% per year

24.2. What are the causes of increase or decrease ?

(a) more/less publications issued

- more
- less

TOTAL (196)	01 Europe (78)	02 North America (37)	03 South America/ Caribbean (18)	04 Africa (24)	06 Australasia/ Oceania (23)	07 Asia/ Far East (16)
27 (14%)	6 (8%)	12 (32%)	- -	6 (25%)	2 (9%)	- -
57 (29%)	21 (27%)	13 (35%)	5 (28%)	3 (13%)	5 (22%)	8 (50%)
92 (46%)	42 (54%)	7 (19%)	15 (83%)	4 (17%)	3 (13%)	10 (63%)
54 (27%)	19 (24%)	14 (38%)	2 (11%)	11 (46%)	3 (13%)	- -
47 (24%)	24 (31%)	10 (27%)	2 (11%)	4 (17%)	4 (17%)	3 (19%)
77 (39%)	30 (38%)	15 (41%)	3 (17%)	8 (33%)	11 (48%)	7 (44%)
47 (24%)	15 (19%)	7 (19%)	8 (44%)	7 (29%)	7 (30%)	3 (19%)
13 (7%)	6 (8%)	4 (11%)	2 (11%)	- -	- -	1 (6%)
4 (2%)	- -	2 (5%)	1 (6%)	1 (4%)	- -	- -
5 (3%)	- -	3 (8%)	- -	2 (8%)	- -	- -
118 (59%)	40 (52%)	19 (51%)	10 (56%)	17 (71%)	16 (70%)	12 (75%)
8 (4%)	- -	6 (16%)	1 (6%)	- -	- -	1 (6%)

	TOTAL (196)	01 Europe (78)	02 North America (37)	03 South America/ Caribbean (18)	04 Africa (24)	06 Australasia/ Oceania (23)	07 Asia/ Far East (16)
(b) more/less issuing sources							
- more	79 (40%)	31 (40%)	11 (30%)	8 (44%)	11 (46%)	10 (43%)	6 (38%)
- less	5 (3%)	1 (1%)	1 (3%)	1 (6%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	-
(c) more/less effective identification of sources							
- more	52 (26%)	15 (19%)	16 (43%)	7 (39%)	5 (21%)	7 (30%)	2 (13%)
- less	5 (3%)	1 (1%)	1 (3%)	1 (6%)	1 (4%)	-	-
(d) more/less effective tracing of publications							
- more	58 (29%)	17 (22%)	15 (41%)	8 (44%)	6 (25%)	9 (39%)	2 (13%)
- less	7 (4%)	1 (1%)	1 (3%)	3 (17%)	2 (8%)	-	-
(e) more/less effective deposit arrangements							
- more	41 (21%)	10 (13%)	15 (41%)	3 (17%)	4 (17%)	6 (26%)	3 (19%)
- less	5 (3%)	1 (1%)	1 (3%)	2 (11%)	1 (4%)	-	1 (6%)
(f) more/less funds available							
- more	14 (7%)	5 (6%)	1 (3%)	3 (17%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	2 (13%)
- less	11 (6%)	4 (5%)	4 (11%)	1 (6%)	2 (8%)	-	-
(g) more/less effective acquisition procedure							
- more	41 (21%)	12 (15%)	11 (30%)	4 (22%)	5 (21%)	8 (35%)	1 (6%)
- less	3 (2%)	1 (1%)	-	1 (6%)	-	-	1 (6%)
(h) change in acquisition policy, causing							
- increase	25 (13%)	10 (13%)	5 (14%)	3 (17%)	3 (13%)	3 (13%)	1 (6%)
- decrease	7 (4%)	2 (3%)	3 (8%)	1 (6%)	1 (4%)	-	-
24.3. With which main sources of official publications are the increases/decrease associated?							
(a) the legislature							
- increase	64 (32%)	20 (26%)	18 (49%)	3 (17%)	6 (25%)	12 (52%)	4 (25%)
- decrease	4 (2%)	-	1 (3%)	1 (6%)	1 (4%)	-	1 (6%)

	TOTAL (196)	01 Europe (78)	02 North America (37)	03 South America/ Caribbean (18)	04 Africa (24)	06 Australasia/ Oceania (23)	07 Asia/ Far East (16)
(b) central government							
- increase	114 (57%)	39 (50%)	20 (54%)	9 (50%)	16 (67%)	17 (74%)	10 (63%)
- decrease	12 (6%)	2 (3%)	4 (11%)	2 (11%)	3 (13%)	1 (4%)	-
(c) sources in category iv of the Definition at App.A							
- increase	73 (37%)	31 (40%)	7 (19%)	8 (44%)	6 (25%)	12 (52%)	8 (50%)
- decrease	9 (5%)	2 (3%)	4 (11%)	1 (6%)	2 (8%)	-	-
[25.1. Data not separately analysed.	See comment in report]						
26.1. Is your library, or official publications collection (if separate) freely accessible							
- to the general public ?	121 (61%)	38 (49%)	31 (84%)	11 (61%)	15 (63%)	15 (65%)	9 (56%)
- only to members of the public who can show a special interest ?	44 (22%)	25 (32%)	6 (16%)	4 (22%)	6 (25%)	2 (9%)	1 (6%)
- to students and researchers of your own institution ?	57 (29%)	26 (33%)	6 (16%)	5 (28%)	8 (33%)	7 (30%)	5 (31%)
- to students and researchers of other institutions ?	49 (25%)	21 (27%)	8 (22%)	5 (28%)	9 (38%)	4 (17%)	2 (13%)
26.2. Does your library give borrow- ing privileges for official publications							
- to all authorised users ?	74 (37%)	23 (29%)	19 (51%)	8 (44%)	4 (17%)	12 (52%)	8 (50%)
- to limited classes of users?	71 (36%)	28 (36%)	11 (30%)	4 (22%)	10 (42%)	9 (39%)	6 (38%)
- not at all ?	51 (26%)	22 (28%)	10 (27%)	6 (33%)	11 (46%)	1 (4%)	1 (6%)
27.1. Has your library a specific official documents librarian ?							
- Yes	83 (42%)	26 (33%)	28 (76%)	5 (28%)	9 (38%)	12 (52%)	2 (13%)
- No	113 (57%)	51 (65%)	9 (24%)	13 (72%)	15 (62%)	11 (48%)	13 (81%)

	TOTAL (196)	01 Europe (78)	02 North America (37)	03 South America/ Caribbean (18)	04 Africa (24)	06 Australasia/ Oceania (23)	07 Asia/ Far East (16)
28.1. Is a printed guide available to enquirers about the arrangement and content of the official publications collection, whether integrated or separate ?							
- Yes	61 (31%)	21 (27%)	17 (46%)	4 (22%)	10 (42%)	6 (26%)	3 (19%)
- No	134 (67%)	55 (71%)	20 (54%)	14 (78%)	13 (54%)	17 (74%)	12 (75%)
29.1. If your library's official publications collection is accessible to the general public, how do you make this known ?							
- no special measures	89 (45%)	35 (45%)	15 (41%)	14 (78%)	8 (33%)	9 (39%)	7 (44%)
- notices in library	28 (14%)	10 (13%)	6 (16%)	3 (17%)	4 (17%)	2 (9%)	2 (13%)
- notices in other local libraries	4 (2%)	1 (1%)	1 (3%)	1 (6%)	- -	- -	1 (6%)
- notices in guides to library services	50 (25%)	14 (18%)	16 (43%)	1 (6%)	8 (33%)	5 (22%)	3 (19%)
- advertisement in local media	5 (3%)	2 (3%)	- -	- -	2 (8%)	1 (4%)	- -
30.1. What proportion of official publications is on open shelves (i.e. may be consulted without specific request)?							
- none	41 (21%)	15 (19%)	4 (11%)	6 (33%)	10 (42%)	1 (4%)	4 (25%)
- up to 10%	66 (33%)	32 (41%)	12 (32%)	5 (28%)	5 (21%)	6 (26%)	5 (31%)
- 11% - 50%	16 (8%)	10 (13%)	1 (3%)	- -	1 (4%)	3 (13%)	1 (6%)
- 51% - 75%	8 (4%)	2 (3%)	3 (8%)	- -	1 (4%)	2 (9%)	- -
- more than 75% but not all	30 (15%)	9 (12%)	8 (22%)	3 (17%)	3 (13%)	4 (17%)	3 (19%)
- all	32 (16%)	6 (8%)	9 (24%)	4 (22%)	3 (13%)	7 (30%)	2 (13%)
30.2. If less than all, what is the reason for limitation ?							
- space limitations	77 (39%)	36 (46%)	17 (46%)	4 (22%)	2 (8%)	9 (39%)	8 (50%)
- security considerations	91 (46%)	34 (44%)	19 (51%)	10 (56%)	14 (58%)	9 (39%)	4 (25%)

	TOTAL (196)	01 Europe (78)	02 North America (37)	03 South America/ Caribbean (18)	04 Africa (24)	06 Australasia/ Oceania (23)	07 Asia/ Far East (16)
30.3. If less than 50%, what types of publications are on open shelves ?							
- reference books (e.g. year-books)	74 (37%)	36 (46%)	12 (32%)	4 (22%)	5 (21%)	8 (35%)	7 (44%)
- annual reports	31 (16%)	16 (21%)	3 (8%)	-	1 (4%)	6 (26%)	5 (31%)
- major political, social, economic reports	34 (17%)	19 (24%)	3 (8%)	1 (6%)	1 (4%)	7 (30%)	2 (13%)
- statistical publications	52 (26%)	31 (40%)	6 (16%)	1 (6%)	2 (8%)	6 (26%)	5 (31%)
- others	29 (15%)	17 (22%)	6 (16%)	1 (6%)	1 (4%)	2 (9%)	1 (6%)
30.4. How long does it take library users to obtain official publications not housed on open shelves ?							
- negligible delay	127 (64%)	49 (63%)	24 (65%)	11 (61%)	16 (67%)	14 (61%)	12 (75%)
- up to 2 hours	23 (12%)	12 (15%)	-	3 (17%)	1 (4%)	4 (17%)	1 (6%)
- 2-4 hours	2 (1%)	2 (3%)	-	-	-	-	-
- more than 4 hours but same day	4 (2%)	1 (1%)	2 (5%)	-	1 (4%)	-	-
- more than 1 day	6 (3%)	4 (5%)	-	-	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	-
31.1. How long after receipt by your library are official publications actually available to users ? (average figure)							
- within 1 day	34 (17%)	16 (21%)	5 (14%)	2 (11%)	6 (25%)	3 (13%)	-
- within 3 days	28 (14%)	11 (14%)	9 (24%)	1 (6%)	3 (13%)	4 (17%)	-
- within 1 week	33 (17%)	14 (18%)	6 (16%)	3 (17%)	5 (21%)	-	4 (25%)
- more than 1 week	23 (12%)	10 (13%)	8 (22%)	2 (11%)	3 (13%)	-	-
- more than 2 weeks	77 (39%)	26 (33%)	9 (24%)	9 (50%)	7 (29%)	15 (65%)	11 (69%)
31.2. What are the most common causes of delay in availability of current of official publications to users of your library ?							

- delays in receipt by library after publication
- delays in internal processes (e.g. cataloguing)
- internal access procedures for publications not on open shelves

32.1. Do you weed official publications, and if so after how long and which type of material ?

- collections not weeded
- weeded after 1 year
- weeded after 2 years
- weeded after more than 3 years

33.1. How effective are inter-lending arrangements in terms of :

(a) satisfaction of your requests ?

- less than 50% of requests met
- more than 50% of requests met

(b) average time taken to meet your requests ?

- within 1 week
- within 2 weeks
- more than 2 weeks

33.2. How long does your library take to identify and despatch an official publication interlent ?

TOTAL (196)	01 Europe (78)	02 North America (37)	03 South America/ Caribbean (18)	04 Africa (24)	06 Australasia/ Oceania (23)	07 Asia/ Far East (16)
109 (55%)	42 (54%)	19 (51%)	8 (44%)	13 (54%)	16 (70%)	8 (50%)
124 (62%)	44 (56%)	29 (78%)	14 (78%)	15 (62%)	14 (61%)	8 (50%)
11 (6%)	7 (9%)	-	-	2 (8%)	1 (4%)	1 (6%)
150 (75%)	61 (78%)	23 (62%)	16 (89%)	21 (88%)	17 (74%)	12 (75%)
6 (3%)	1 (1%)	4 (11%)	1 (6%)	-	-	-
7 (4%)	1 (1%)	4 (11%)	-	-	2 (9%)	-
20 (10%)	6 (8%)	7 (19%)	1 (6%)	2 (8%)	3 (13%)	1 (6%)
12 (6%)	4 (5%)	2 (5%)	1 (6%)	2 (8%)	1 (4%)	2 (13%)
88 (44%)	29 (37%)	27 (73%)	7 (39%)	6 (25%)	11 (48%)	7 (44%)
41 (21%)	12 (15%)	8 (22%)	8 (44%)	1 (4%)	5 (22%)	7 (44%)
32 (16%)	8 (10%)	13 (35%)	-	4 (17%)	4 (17%)	2 (13%)
28 (14%)	13 (17%)	8 (22%)	-	3 (13%)	3 (13%)	1 (6%)

	TOTAL (196)	01 Europe (78)	02 North America (37)	03 South America/ Caribbean (18)	04 Africa (24)	06 Australasia/ Oceania (23)	07 Asia/ Far East (16)
- 1 day	32 (16%)	15 (19%)	3 (8%)	4 (22%)	4 (17%)	3 (13%)	3 (19%)
- 2-3 days	59 (30%)	18 (23%)	23 (62%)	4 (22%)	2 (8%)	9 (39%)	3 (19%)
- more than 3 days	24 (12%)	9 (12%)	4 (11%)	-	2 (8%)	5 (22%)	4 (25%)
33.3. What are the main causes of difficulty and delay in interlending ?							
- difficulty in identification	43 (22%)	14 (18%)	19 (51%)	1 (6%)	1 (4%)	6 (26%)	2 (13%)
- incomplete knowledge of interlending collections	16 (8%)	5 (6%)	7 (19%)	3 (17%)	-	-	1 (6%)
- handling time	44 (22%)	17 (22%)	10 (27%)	2 (11%)	3 (13%)	7 (30%)	4 (25%)
- postal time	40 (20%)	9 (12%)	14 (38%)	3 (17%)	5 (21%)	5 (22%)	2 (13%)
34.1. Is your library's official publications collection separate or integrated ?							
- wholly separate	45 (23%)	10 (13%)	17 (46%)	3 (17%)	10 (42%)	3 (13%)	2 (13%)
- partly separate	67 (34%)	26 (33%)	13 (35%)	5 (28%)	5 (21%)	10 (43%)	7 (44%)
- wholly integrated	84 (42%)	41 (53%)	7 (19%)	10 (56%)	9 (38%)	9 (39%)	6 (38%)
34.2. How do you indicate this to users ?							
- no special indication	91 (46%)	41 (53%)	10 (27%)	10 (56%)	6 (25%)	13 (56%)	10 (63%)
- notices displayed in library	46 (23%)	11 (14%)	15 (41%)	3 (17%)	9 (38%)	4 (17%)	3 (19%)
- notices in catalogues/indexes	77 (39%)	29 (37%)	21 (57%)	7 (39%)	10 (42%)	8 (35%)	2 (13%)
35.1. How are official publications incorporated in your main library catalogue ?							
(a) not at all	17 (9%)	4 (5%)	8 (22%)	1 (6%)	3 (13%)	-	1 (6%)
(b) selectively by class							
- by subject	21 (11%)	9 (12%)	2 (5%)	1 (6%)	4 (17%)	3 (13%)	2 (13%)
- by title	15 (8%)	6 (8%)	2 (5%)	1 (6%)	2 (8%)	-	4 (25%)
- by author/issuing source	17 (9%)	6 (8%)	2 (5%)	2 (11%)	4 (17%)	1 (4%)	2 (13%)

	TOTAL (196)	01 Europe (78)	02 North America (37)	03 South America/ Caribbean (18)	04 Africa (24)	06 Australasia/ Oceania (23)	07 Asia/ Far East (16)
(c) selectively by item							
- by subject	28 (14%)	7 (9%)	15 (41%)	- -	1 (4%)	5 (22%)	- -
- by title	27 (14%)	6 (8%)	15 (41%)	1 (6%)	1 (4%)	4 (17%)	- -
- by author/issuing source	35 (18%)	13 (17%)	16 (43%)	- -	2 (8%)	4 (17%)	- -
(d) complete coverage							
- by subject	88 (44%)	39 (50%)	6 (16%)	14 (78%)	11 (46%)	12 (52%)	4 (25%)
- by title	89 (45%)	35 (45%)	7 (19%)	13 (72%)	9 (38%)	15 (65%)	8 (50%)
- by author/issuing source	111 (56%)	46 (59%)	10 (27%)	15 (83%)	15 (62%)	17 (74%)	6 (38%)
35.2. Do you have a separate official publications catalogue ?							
(a) No	118 (59%)	49 (63%)	12 (32%)	12 (67%)	11 (46%)	19 (83%)	12 (75%)
(b) Yes	66 (33%)	25 (32%)	22 (59%)	4 (22%)	10 (42%)	3 (13%)	2 (13%)
- by subject	25 (13%)	8 (10%)	11 (30%)	2 (11%)	4 (17%)	- -	- -
- by title	27 (14%)	11 (14%)	7 (19%)	3 (17%)	3 (13%)	2 (9%)	1 (6%)
- by author/issuing source	54 (27%)	19 (24%)	20 (54%)	4 (22%)	7 (29%)	3 (13%)	1 (6%)
- by class	9 (5%)	3 (4%)	2 (5%)	1 (6%)	3 (13%)	- -	- -
35.3. Do you use lists, catalogues and indexes of issuing sources :							
(a) as sole means of identify- ing and finding official publications ?							
- Yes	38 (19%)	12 (15%)	5 (14%)	3 (17%)	7 (29%)	5 (22%)	6 (38%)
- No	101 (51%)	40 (51%)	20 (59%)	8 (44%)	8 (33%)	15 (65%)	5 (31%)
(b) to identify titles before searching library catalogues ?							
- Yes	78 (39%)	25 (32%)	22 (59%)	2 (11%)	6 (25%)	14 (61%)	8 (50%)
- No	53 (27%)	26 (33%)	9 (24%)	8 (44%)	3 (13%)	5 (22%)	2 (13%)

(c) annotated as finding aids?

- Yes
- No

35.4. If there are any relevant to your jurisdiction, how far do you use commercially-produced catalogues/indexes to official publications ?

- heavily used in preference to official lists and catalogues
- used to supplement official lists and catalogues
- not used/little used: official material preferred

36.1. Do you cross-reference official publications entered in your main library catalogue?

- Yes
- No

36.2. If yes, how ?

(a) from main library catalogue by :

- general cross-references by class
- specific cross-references by subject
- specific cross-references by author/issuing source
- specific cross-references by title

(b) to :

- separate official publications catalogue

TOTAL (196)	01 Europe (78)	02 North America (37)	03 South America/ Caribbean (18)	04 Africa (24)	06 Australasia/ Oceania (23)	07 Asia/ Far East (16)
59 (30%)	24 (31%)	15 (41%)	7 (39%)	3 (13%)	6 (26%)	2 (13%)
65 (33%)	26 (33%)	12 (32%)	5 (28%)	6 (25%)	10 (43%)	6 (38%)
6 (3%)	- -	2 (5%)	1 (6%)	2 (8%)	- -	1 (6%)
66 (33%)	24 (31%)	19 (51%)	5 (28%)	8 (33%)	7 (30%)	2 (13%)
46 (23%)	21 (27%)	7 (19%)	2 (11%)	5 (21%)	4 (17%)	5 (31%)
67 (34%)	25 (32%)	12 (32%)	5 (28%)	10 (42%)	8 (35%)	5 (31%)
97 (49%)	36 (46%)	18 (49%)	10 (56%)	8 (33%)	11 (48%)	9 (56%)
17 (9%)	5 (6%)	4 (11%)	1 (6%)	2 (8%)	2 (9%)	1 (6%)
29 (15%)	10 (13%)	3 (8%)	3 (17%)	6 (25%)	4 (17%)	2 (13%)
49 (25%)	19 (24%)	9 (24%)	4 (22%)	6 (25%)	5 (22%)	4 (25%)
27 (14%)	10 (13%)	2 (5%)	2 (11%)	3 (13%)	5 (22%)	3 (19%)
19 (10%)	11 (14%)	5 (14%)	1 (6%)	2 (8%)	- -	- -

- lists and catalogues of issuing sources
- commercially produced lists & catalogues
- enquiry point

37.1. Do you consider your library's cataloguing and referencing of official publications adequate for the needs of users ?

- Yes
- No

37.2. If no, do you have plans to improve it ?

- Yes, within 3 years
- Yes, within 5 years
- No

38.1. Do you record the amount of use which your official publications collection receives by consultation and/or borrowing ?

- not at all
- records of borrowing
- records of requests for titles not on open shelves
- interlending records
- number of visitors to collection

39.1. Do you record the types/ purposes of users of your official publications collection ?

- not at all

TOTAL (196)	01 Europe (78)	02 North America (37)	03 South America/ Caribbean (18)	04 Africa (24)	06 Australasia/ Oceania (23)	07 Asia/ Far East (16)
4 (2%)	1 (1%)	-	-	-	2 (9%)	1 (6%)
1 (1%)	-	-	-	-	1 (4%)	-
11 (6%)	1 (1%)	5 (14%)	1 (6%)	2 (8%)	-	-
135 (68%)	60 (77%)	20 (54%)	11 (61%)	15 (62%)	15 (65%)	11 (69%)
54 (27%)	13 (17%)	16 (43%)	7 (39%)	7 (29%)	7 (30%)	3 (19%)
26 (13%)	6 (8%)	10 (27%)	3 (17%)	4 (17%)	2 (9%)	-
16 (8%)	4 (5%)	6 (16%)	-	1 (4%)	4 (17%)	1 (6%)
18 (9%)	6 (8%)	3 (8%)	3 (17%)	2 (8%)	2 (9%)	2 (13%)
114 (57%)	59 (76%)	10 (27%)	10 (56%)	12 (50%)	13 (57%)	10 (63%)
43 (22%)	8 (10%)	15 (41%)	3 (17%)	6 (25%)	7 (30%)	4 (25%)
25 (13%)	7 (9%)	4 (11%)	4 (22%)	7 (29%)	-	2 (13%)
31 (16%)	10 (13%)	10 (27%)	3 (17%)	2 (8%)	5 (22%)	1 (6%)
40 (20%)	10 (13%)	9 (24%)	5 (28%)	9 (38%)	2 (9%)	4 (25%)
146 (73%)	60 (77%)	30 (81%)	12 (67%)	13 (54%)	19 (83%)	11 (69%)

- use by general public
- academic and professional users
- business and government users

[40.1. Not separately analysed]

[41.1. Not separately analysed.

42.1. Does your library collect publications of local authorities ?

- No
- Yes
- within own jurisdiction
- on a wider scale within the country

42.2. How many tiers or kinds of local authorities have significant publishing output within your jurisdiction ?

- less than 4
- 4 or more

42.3. How does your library trace publications of local authorities ?

- from published lists
- from unpublished lists
- by other means

42.4. What are the major problems in collecting publications of local authorities ?

- difficulties of tracing
- difficulties in obtaining when traced
- others

TOTAL (196)	01 Europe (78)	02 North America (37)	03 South America/ Caribbean (18)	04 Africa (24)	06 Australasia/ Oceania (23)	07 Asia/ Far East (16)
28 (14%)	6 (8%)	6 (16%)	4 (22%)	5 (21%)	2 (9%)	3 (19%)
33 (17%)	6 (8%)	3 (8%)	4 (22%)	10 (42%)	1 (4%)	3 (19%)
22 (11%)	6 (8%)	4 (11%)	2 (11%)	7 (29%)	1 (4%)	2 (13%)
See Appendix A.]						
43 (22%)	22 (28%)	3 (8%)	4 (22%)	7 (29%)	4 (17%)	3 (19%)
143 (72%)	53 (68%)	31 (84%)	12 (67%)	16 (67%)	17 (74%)	11 (69%)
53 (27%)	21 (27%)	14 (38%)	3 (17%)	3 (13%)	8 (35%)	3 (19%)
69 (35%)	25 (32%)	15 (41%)	4 (22%)	9 (38%)	9 (39%)	7 (44%)
67 (34%)	15 (19%)	22 (59%)	6 (33%)	7 (29%)	11 (48%)	5 (31%)
64 (32%)	34 (44%)	8 (22%)	4 (22%)	6 (25%)	6 (26%)	4 (25%)
63 (32%)	20 (26%)	21 (57%)	1 (6%)	3 (13%)	11 (48%)	6 (38%)
20 (10%)	8 (10%)	10 (27%)	-	-	2 (9%)	-
103 (52%)	36 (46%)	26 (70%)	10 (56%)	13 (54%)	10 (43%)	6 (38%)
111 (56%)	36 (46%)	29 (78%)	11 (61%)	12 (50%)	14 (61%)	7 (44%)
56 (28%)	15 (19%)	22 (59%)	4 (22%)	3 (13%)	9 (39%)	3 (19%)
13 (7%)	3 (4%)	6 (16%)	2 (11%)	-	-	1 (6%)

	TOTAL (196)	01 Europe (78)	02 North America (37)	03 South America/ Caribbean (18)	04 Africa (24)	06 Australasia/ Oceania (23)	07 Asia/ Far East (16)
42.5. Does your library include publications of local authorities in official publications collections which are separately shelved?							
- Yes	55 (28%)	14 (18%)	19 (51%)	4 (22%)	8 (33%)	5 (22%)	4 (25%)
- No	68 (34%)	32 (41%)	12 (32%)	4 (22%)	6 (25%)	9 (39%)	4 (25%)
43.1. Does your library collect publications of inter-governmental international organisations ?							
- No	17 (9%)	5 (6%)	3 (8%)	-	4 (17%)	2 (9%)	3 (19%)
- Yes	154 (77%)	63 (81%)	26 (70%)	16 (89%)	17 (71%)	18 (78%)	11 (69%)
- from organisations based within own jurisdiction or country	35 (18%)	14 (18%)	9 (24%)	1 (6%)	3 (13%)	6 (26%)	2 (13%)
- on a wider scale	122 (61%)	54 (69%)	20 (54%)	10 (56%)	12 (50%)	14 (61%)	9 (56%)
43.2. Are such publications collected :							
(a) as deposits received from particular organisations ?	88 (44%)	34 (44%)	16 (43%)	11 (61%)	12 (50%)	9 (39%)	5 (31%)
(b) as a result of collecting policy :							
- for coverage of specific organisations or groups (e.g. the U.N. family) ?	99 (50%)	44 (56%)	17 (46%)	9 (50%)	13 (54%)	10 (43%)	4 (25%)
- for subject coverage ?	67 (34%)	26 (33%)	16 (43%)	3 (17%)	6 (25%)	10 (43%)	4 (25%)
- for regional collections ?	31 (16%)	11 (14%)	5 (14%)	6 (33%)	3 (13%)	4 (17%)	1 (6%)
43.3. Does your library							
- maintain a special collection of intergovernmental organisations publications?	43 (22%)	17 (22%)	6 (16%)	7 (39%)	6 (25%)	3 (13%)	2 (13%)

	TOTAL (196)	01 Europe (78)	02 North America (37)	03 South America/ Caribbean (18)	04 Africa (24)	06 Australasia/ Oceania (23)	07 Asia/ Far East (16)
- integrate them with a special collection of official publications ?	46 (23%)	22 (28%)	10 (27%)	2 (11%)	5 (21%)	7 (30%)	1 (6%)
- integrate them with the main library collections ?	92 (46%)	37 (47%)	16 (43%)	9 (50%)	7 (29%)	13 (57%)	9 (56%)
[43.4. Not separately analysed. See comment in report.]							
43.5. What are the main difficulties in tracing and acquiring the publications of international organisations ?							
- inadequacy of published indexes and catalogues	58 (29%)	27 (35%)	14 (38%)	3 (17%)	- -	12 (52%)	2 (13%)
- difficulty in obtaining published lists and catalogues	56 (28%)	23 (29%)	7 (19%)	4 (22%)	7 (29%)	8 (35%)	6 (38%)
- lack of local agencies for ordering and purchase	37 (19%)	10 (13%)	7 (19%)	3 (17%)	6 (25%)	8 (35%)	3 (19%)
- difficulties with direct ordering from the organisations themselves	56 (28%)	19 (24%)	12 (32%)	6 (33%)	7 (29%)	6 (26%)	5 (31%)
43.6. Are collections of international organisations' publications							
- specially catalogued or indexed ?	20 (10%)	10 (13%)	2 (5%)	3 (17%)	2 (8%)	- -	11 (69%)
- catalogued or indexed in the same way as other official publications ?	102 (51%)	42 (54%)	17 (46%)	11 (61%)	8 (33%)	15 (65%)	8 (50%)
- available to users on the same basis as other official publications ?	117 (59%)	50 (64%)	18 (49%)	12 (67%)	10 (42%)	15 (65%)	10 (63%)

43.7. Does your library use
information retrieval
systems of intergovern-
mental agencies (e.g.
AGRIS, ISIS) ?

- No
- Yes

TOTAL (196)	01 Europe (78)	02 North America (37)	03 South America/ Caribbean (18)	04 Africa (24)	06 Australasia/ Oceania (23)	07 Asia/ Far East (16)
135 (68%) 16 (8%)	60 (77%) 2 (3%)	21 (57%) 4 (11%)	12 (67%) 3 (17%)	18 (75%) -	12 (52%) 5 (22%)	10 (63%) 2 (13%)

141

142

APPENDIX C.

ANALYSIS OF REPLIES TO QUESTIONNAIRE - BY TYPE OF LIBRARY

Key

- 01 = National libraries
- 02 = State/provincial libraries
- 03 = Parliamentary/legislative libraries
- 04 = Administrative libraries
- 05 = University/academic libraries
- 06 = Public libraries

ANALYSIS OF REPLIES TO QUESTIONNAIRE: BY TYPE OF LIBRARY

	TOTAL (199)	01 National (46)	02 State (19)	03 Parliamentary (22)	04 Administrative (27)	05 University (57)	06 Public (28)
1.1. How long has your library collected official publications ?							
- less than 10 years	15 (8%)	4 (9%)	1 (5%)	- -	4 (7%)	4 (7%)	4 (14%)
- 11-20 years	34 (17%)	9 (20%)	1 (5%)	- -	15 (19%)	15 (26%)	3 (11%)
- over 20 years	147 (74%)	32 (70%)	16 (84%)	22 (100%)	18 (67%)	37 (65%)	21 (75%)
1.2. Has acquisition of official publications been continuous over that period ?							
- Yes	183 (92%)	46 (100%)	17 (89%)	22 (100%)	21 (78%)	51 (89%)	24 (81%)
- No	15 (8%)	- -	1 (6%)	- -	4 (15%)	6 (11%)	4 (14%)
1.3. Are there significant gaps in the collection ?							
- Yes	73 (37%)	19 (41%)	4 (21%)	6 (27%)	6 (22%)	22 (39%)	14 (50%)
- in subject continuity	34 (17%)	5 (11%)	1 (5%)	6 (27%)	3 (11%)	9 (16%)	8 (29%)
- in period continuity	65 (33%)	15 (33%)	4 (21%)	3 (14%)	6 (22%)	21 (37%)	14 (50%)
- continuity of sources	47 (24%)	13 (28%)	6 (32%)	2 (9%)	5 (19%)	10 (18%)	9 (32%)
- no	101 (51%)	21 (46%)	11 (58%)	11 (50%)	17 (63%)	29 (51%)	12 (43%)

Notes : (1) Special and technical libraries have been omitted, as there were too few libraries in this category to provide valid information.

(2) Any apparent discrepancies between the figures given in the TOTAL column and the total obtained by adding up the individual columns are accounted for by this.

(3) Percentages are given as percentages of the number of respondents of each type

	TOTAL (199)	01 National (46)	02 State (19)	03 Parliamentary (22)	04 Administrative (27)	05 University (57)	06 Public (28)
1.4. If your answer is Yes, what are the causes ?							
- changes in library acquisition policy	37 (19%)	3 (6%)	- -	2 (9%)	3 (11%)	18 (32%)	10 (36%)
- changes in basis of deposit	22 (11%)	5 (11%)	3 (16%)	2 (9%)	2 (7%)	6 (11%)	4 (14%)
- weeding of collection	10 (5%)	1 (2%)	- -	2 (9%)	3 (11%)	1 (2%)	3 (11%)
- accidental loss or destruction	32 (16%)	8 (17%)	4 (21%)	3 (14%)	3 (11%)	9 (16%)	5 (18%)
2.1. How would you describe your library's level of collect- ing of official publications on the terms stated in App.A, para.3 ?							
- highly selective	21 (11%)	- -	1 (5%)	2 (9%)	7 (26%)	5 (9%)	5 (18%)
- selective	29 (15%)	1 (2%)	2 (11%)	- -	12 (44%)	11 (19%)	3 (11%)
- comprehensive	71 (36%)	16 (35%)	5 (26%)	9 (41%)	24 (15%)	24 (42%)	12 (43%)
- exhaustive	75 (38%)	28 (61%)	11 (58%)	11 (50%)	2 (7%)	16 (28%)	8 (29%)
3.1. What estimated proportion does your library attempt to collect of official publications from the sources covered by the Definition of an Official Source at App.A ?							
(a) categories i-iii							
- up to 50%	34 (17%)	24 (52%)	2 (11%)	1 (5%)	10 (37%)	9 (16%)	7 (25%)
- more than 50% but not all	64 (32%)	7 (15%)	3 (16%)	7 (31%)	8 (30%)	26 (46%)	12 (43%)
- all	89 (45%)	33 (72%)	14 (74%)	12 (54%)	4 (15%)	19 (33%)	7 (25%)
(b) category (iv)							
- up to 50%	60 (30%)	4 (9%)	4 (21%)	6 (27%)	10 (37%)	24 (42%)	10 (36%)
- more than 50% but not all	48 (24%)	6 (13%)	2 (11%)	4 (18%)	5 (19%)	19 (33%)	11 (39%)
- all	59 (30%)	28 (61%)	11 (58%)	7 (31%)	2 (7%)	8 (14%)	4 (14%)

3.2. How far do you achieve these objectives ?

(a) categories i-iii

- less than 50%
- 50% - 75%
- more than 75%
- but not totally
- totally

(b) category (iv)

- less than 50%
- 50% - 75%
- more than 75%
- but not totally
- totally

4.1. Does your library receive deposits of official publications from sources within your jurisdiction

(a) by legal right ?

- full deposits
- selective deposits
- no deposits

or

(b) by administrative instruction ?

- full deposits
- selective deposits
- no deposits

or

(c) on both bases, depending on the type of source ?

- full deposits
- selective deposits
- no deposits

TOTAL (199)	01 National (46)	02 State (19)	03 Parliamentary (22)	04 Administrative (27)	05 University (57)	06 Public (28)
30 (15%)	3 (7%)	3 (16%)	2 (9%)	4 (15%)	9 (16%)	8 (29%)
38 (19%)	11 (24%)	4 (21%)	1 (5%)	7 (26%)	10 (18%)	5 (18%)
92 (46%)	22 (48%)	10 (53%)	11 (50%)	7 (26%)	30 (53%)	10 (36%)
26 (13%)	8 (17%)	2 (11%)	6 (27%)	4 (15%)	4 (7%)	3 (11%)
50 (25%)	6 (13%)	5 (26%)	6 (27%)	6 (22%)	18 (32%)	8 (29%)
36 (18%)	7 (15%)	3 (16%)	3 (13%)	4 (15%)	12 (21%)	7 (25%)
65 (33%)	18 (39%)	8 (42%)	9 (40%)	5 (19%)	18 (32%)	7 (25%)
13 (7%)	6 (13%)	- -	- -	2 (7%)	3 (5%)	2 (7%)
66 (33%)	32 (70%)	7 (37%)	6 (27%)	2 (7%)	14 (25%)	5 (18%)
11 (6%)	2 (4%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	1 (4%)	3 (5%)	3 (11%)
18 (9%)	2 (4%)	- -	1 (5%)	4 (15%)	9 (16%)	1 (4%)
35 (18%)	4 (9%)	5 (26%)	7 (31%)	7 (26%)	11 (19%)	1 (4%)
18 (9%)	1 (2%)	- -	1 (5%)	4 (15%)	8 (14%)	4 (14%)
13 (7%)	2 (4%)	- -	1 (5%)	3 (11%)	5 (9%)	1 (4%)
14 (7%)	4 (9%)	3 (16%)	4 (18%)	- -	3 (5%)	- -
3 (2%)	- -	1 (5%)	- -	- -	- -	2 (7%)
16 (8%)	2 (4%)	- -	1 (5%)	4 (15%)	6 (11%)	2 (7%)

- 114 -

	TOTAL (199)	01 National (46)	02 State (19)	03 Parliamentary (22)	04 Administrative (27)	05 University (57)	06 Public (28)
(b) 'official'							
- Yes	50 (25%)	11 (24%)	5 (26%)	8 (36%)	7 (26%)	14 (25%)	5 (18%)
- No	60 (30%)	18 (39%)	9 (47%)	8 (36%)	4 (15%)	16 (28%)	5 (18%)
(c) 'government'							
- Yes	51 (26%)	12 (26%)	7 (37%)	5 (22%)	6 (22%)	16 (28%)	5 (18%)
- No	60 (30%)	17 (37%)	8 (42%)	11 (50%)	5 (19%)	14 (25%)	5 (18%)
(d) government departments							
- Yes	53 (27%)	13 (28%)	6 (32%)	7 (31%)	4 (15%)	17 (30%)	6 (21%)
- No	55 (28%)	17 (37%)	9 (47%)	8 (36%)	5 (19%)	12 (21%)	4 (14%)
(e) the range of publications to be deposited							
- Yes	94 (47%)	26 (56%)	12 (63%)	13 (59%)	6 (22%)	24 (42%)	9 (32%)
- No	20 (10%)	8 (17%)	2 (11%)	4 (18%)	2 (7%)	3 (5%)	1 (4%)
(f) the sources obliged to deposit							
- Yes	81 (41%)	28 (61%)	8 (42%)	11 (50%)	7 (26%)	18 (32%)	10 (36%)
- No	34 (17%)	7 (15%)	7 (37%)	5 (22%)	3 (11%)	10 (18%)	1 (4%)
(g) the libraries entitled to receive deposits							
- Yes	102 (51%)	32 (67%)	13 (68%)	13 (59%)	6 (22%)	28 (49%)	11 (39%)
- No	17 (9%)	3 (7%)	3 (16%)	2 (9%)	3 (11%)	3 (5%)	3 (11%)
7.1. What is your library's policy in accepting deposits of official publications ?							
- because they are offered	19 (10%)	3 (7%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	-	9 (16%)	3 (11%)
- to maintain a complete collection	112 (56%)	37 (80%)	15 (79%)	18 (81%)	5 (19%)	26 (46%)	11 (39%)
- selective general coverage	21 (11%)	4 (9%)	-	4 (18%)	4 (15%)	8 (14%)	1 (4%)
- specific subject coverage	18 (9%)	-	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	11 (41%)	4 (7%)	1 (4%)
7.2. Does your library decline or forgo any deposit rights ?							
- No	115 (58%)	34 (74%)	15 (79%)	12 (54%)	10 (37%)	31 (54%)	13 (46%)

	TOTAL (199)	01 National (46)	02 State (19)	03 Parliamentary (22)	04 Administrative (27)	05 University (57)	06 Public (28)
- Yes, because of collecting level	23 (12%)	6 (13%)	1 (5%)	8 (36%)	4 (15%)	4 (7%)	1 (4%)
- Yes, because of storage limitations	10 (5%)	2 (4%)	1 (5%)	2 (9%)	1 (4%)	2 (4%)	2 (7%)
8.1. How far are deposits actually offered by official sources effective, in terms of :							
(a) compliance with laws or instructions ?							
- less than 50%	17 (9%)	5 (11%)	3 (16%)	3 (13%)	3 (11%)	3 (5%)	- -
- 50% - 80%	25 (13%)	7 (15%)	5 (26%)	- -	- -	11 (19%)	2 (7%)
- over 80% but not totally	62 (31%)	20 (43%)	5 (26%)	12 (54%)	5 (19%)	11 (19%)	7 (25%)
- totally	17 (9%)	5 (11%)	- -	1 (5%)	3 (11%)	6 (11%)	2 (7%)
(b) number of official sources known ?							
- less than 50%	13 (7%)	5 (11%)	1 (5%)	- -	3 (11%)	3 (5%)	1 (4%)
- 50% - 80%	32 (16%)	7 (15%)	5 (26%)	3 (13%)	4 (15%)	11 (19%)	2 (7%)
- over 80% but not totally	64 (32%)	17 (37%)	7 (37%)	12 (54%)	4 (15%)	14 (25%)	8 (29%)
- totally	10 (5%)	4 (9%)	- -	1 (5%)	- -	3 (5%)	2 (7%)
(c) volume of publications known to be issued ?							
- less than 50%	17 (9%)	3 (7%)	2 (11%)	3 (13%)	2 (7%)	6 (11%)	1 (4%)
- 50% - 80%	39 (20%)	8 (17%)	5 (26%)	2 (9%)	5 (19%)	13 (23%)	5 (18%)
- over 80% but not totally	59 (30%)	18 (39%)	7 (37%)	11 (50%)	3 (11%)	13 (23%)	6 (21%)
- totally	7 (4%)	3 (7%)	- -	- -	1 (4%)	1 (2%)	2 (7%)
9.1. If deposits are offered selectively from the full range of official publications issued :							
(a) is the selection offered made by							
- each issuing source ?	43 (22%)	9 (20%)	7 (37%)	3 (13%)	8 (30%)	8 (14%)	7 (25%)
- a central official source ?	26 (13%)	3 (7%)	3 (16%)	2 (9%)	1 (4%)	12 (21%)	5 (18%)
(b) what is the basis of the							

	TOTAL (199)	01 National (46)	02 State (19)	03 Parliamentary (22)	04 Administrative (27)	05 University (57)	06 Public (28)
selection offered:							
- subject of individual publication ?	27 (14%)	3 (7%)	2 (11%)	3 (13%)	7 (26%)	7 (12%)	5 (18%)
- class of publication ?	18 (9%)	3 (7%)	3 (16%)	1 (5%)	3 (11%)	5 (9%)	3 (11%)
- source of publication ?	32 (16%)	7 (15%)	4 (21%)	2 (9%)	5 (19%)	11 (19%)	3 (11%)
10.1. How does your library check deposit receipts of publications ?							
- from published lists and other bibliographic sources	93 (47%)	28 (61%)	11 (58%)	15 (68%)	10 (37%)	20 (35%)	8 (29%)
- against consignment lists without reference to bibliographic sources	47 (24%)	7 (15%)	5 (26%)	6 (27%)	5 (19%)	19 (33%)	5 (18%)
- accepts what arrives without further check	34 (17%)	11 (24%)	3 (16%)	4 (18%)	1 (4%)	8 (14%)	5 (18%)
11.1. Is there a legal or administrative obligation on your library to make deposited publications available for consultation:							
(a) to the general public ?							
- Yes	104 (52%)	31 (67%)	15 (79%)	8 (36%)	7 (26%)	27 (47%)	15 (54%)
(b) to defined groups only	28 (14%)	5 (11%)	1 (5%)	9 (40%)	7 (26%)	5 (9%)	1 (4%)
(c) within specified periods only ?	5 (3%)	1 (2%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	- -	2 (4%)	- -
(d) at all normal opening time ?	118 (59%)	32 (70%)	15 (79%)	12 (54%)	11 (41%)	30 (53%)	16 (57%)
12.1. Does your library solicit gifts of official publications outside deposit arrangements ?							
(a) within own jurisdiction							
- No	21 (11%)	6 (13%)	2 (11%)	-	2 (7%)	9 (16%)	1 (4%)
- Yes, indiscriminately	28 (14%)	6 (13%)	5 (26%)	6 (27%)	2 (7%)	6 (11%)	3 (11%)

	TOTAL (199)	01 National (46)	02 State (19)	03 Parliamentary (22)	04 Administrative (27)	05 University (57)	06 Public (28)
- Yes, selectively	107 (54%)	25 (54%)	7 (37%)	9 (40%)	15 (56%)	36 (63%)	15 (54%)
(b) from other jurisdictions within own country							
- No	21 (11%)	6 (13%)	-	-	3 (11%)	8 (14%)	3 (11%)
- Yes, indiscriminately	11 (6%)	6 (13%)	1 (5%)	2 (9%)	1 (4%)	1 (2%)	-
- Yes, selectively	104 (52%)	19 (41%)	11 (58%)	9 (40%)	14 (52%)	36 (63%)	14 (50%)
12.2. What is your library's policy on unsolicited gifts offered ?							
(a) within own jurisdiction							
- refusal	1 (1%)	1 (2%)	-	-	-	-	-
- indiscriminate acceptance	45 (23%)	11 (24%)	7 (37%)	6 (27%)	1 (4%)	13 (23%)	7 (25%)
- selective acceptance	119 (60%)	26 (56%)	7 (37%)	12 (54%)	19 (70%)	40 (70%)	12 (43%)
(b) from other jurisdictions within own country							
- refusal	2 (1%)	1 (2%)	-	-	1 (4%)	-	-
- indiscriminate acceptance	27 (14%)	9 (20%)	3 (16%)	3 (13%)	1 (4%)	8 (14%)	3 (11%)
- selective acceptance	117 (59%)	22 (48%)	10 (53%)	12 (54%)	15 (56%)	42 (74%)	13 (46%)
13.1. Does your library purchase official publications from sources within your jurisdic- tion ?							
- as sole means of acquisition	18 (9%)	1 (2%)	-	-	3 (11%)	7 (12%)	7 (25%)
- to supplement acquisition by deposit/gift	132 (66%)	24 (52%)	14 (74%)	14 (63%)	14 (52%)	46 (81%)	20 (71%)
14.1. How are official publications for purchase traced ?							
- from published lists and catalogues	139 (70%)	20 (43%)	14 (74%)	13 (59%)	16 (59%)	52 (91%)	22 (79%)
- from unpublished lists and 'contacts'	91 (46%)	13 (28%)	7 (37%)	12 (54%)	12 (44%)	27 (48%)	19 (68%)
- by searching ADP data bases	12 (6%)	3 (7%)	1 (5%)	2 (9%)	2 (7%)	2 (4%)	2 (7%)

	TOTAL (199)	01 National (46)	02 State (19)	03 Parliamentary (22)	04 Administrative (27)	05 University (57)	06 Public (28)
15.1. Does your library receive any discount concession on purchase of priced official publications?							
- None	113 (57%)	19 (41%)	15 (79%)	10 (45%)	12 (44%)	41 (72%)	16 (59%)
- up to 10%	20 (10%)	2 (4%)	-	3 (13%)	2 (7%)	8 (14%)	4 (14%)
- 11% - 25%	9 (5%)	1 (2%)	-	1 (5%)	3 (11%)	3 (5%)	-
- 26% - 50%	6 (3%)	2 (4%)	1 (5%)	-	-	-	3 (11%)
- more than 50%	3 (2%)	-	-	-	-	-	3 (11%)
16.1. How do you purchase official publications ?							
- from some or all issuing sources	99 (50%)	14 (30%)	14 (74%)	8 (36%)	13 (48%)	31 (54%)	17 (61%)
- from a central official source	62 (31%)	7 (15%)	5 (26%)	6 (27%)	4 (15%)	27 (47%)	12 (43%)
- through commercial agents	56 (28%)	10 (22%)	1 (5%)	5 (22%)	8 (30%)	22 (39%)	10 (36%)
- by arrangements with official sources not available to the general public	14 (7%)	-	1 (5%)	2 (9%)	6 (22%)	4 (7%)	1 (4%)
17.1. Does your library acquire any official publications in micro-form ?							
- Yes	101 (51%)	19 (41%)	14 (74%)	15 (68%)	9 (33%)	32 (56%)	11 (39%)
- No	94 (47%)	27 (59%)	4 (21%)	7 (31%)	14 (52%)	23 (40%)	17 (61%)
17.2. If your answer is Yes :							
(a) what is the reason for acquisition ?							
- publication is issued in microform only	48 (24%)	10 (21%)	10 (53%)	3 (13%)	3 (11%)	17 (30%)	4 (14%)
- because microforms are available	29 (15%)	5 (11%)	5 (26%)	3 (13%)	5 (19%)	8 (14%)	3 (11%)
- to fill gaps in collection	48 (24%)	10 (21%)	4 (21%)	4 (18%)	3 (11%)	22 (39%)	5 (18%)
- to save shelf-space occupied by little-used or old publications	43 (22%)	6 (13%)	-	9 (40%)	5 (19%)	10 (18%)	8 (29%)

	TOTAL (199)	01 National (46)	02 State (19)	03 Parliamentary (22)	04 Administrative (27)	05 University (57)	06 Public (28)
- as additional copies of printed publications	38 (19%)	10 (21%)	5 (26%)	6 (27%)	4 (15%)	8 (14%)	5 (18%)
(b) what is the method of acquisition ?							
- automatic or selective deposit	39 (20%)	10 (21%)	8 (42%)	6 (27%)	2 (8%)	11 (19%)	1 (4%)
- purchase of official microforms	41 (21%)	5 (11%)	- -	7 (31%)	6 (22%)	14 (25%)	7 (25%)
- purchase of commercially published microforms	57 (29%)	8 (17%)	6 (32%)	10 (45%)	4 (15%)	23 (40%)	5 (18%)
(c) what proportion of your collection is in microform ?							
- less than 5%	81 (41%)	13 (28%)	10 (53%)	14 (63%)	8 (30%)	25 (44%)	10 (36%)
- more than 5%	16 (8%)	5 (11%)	2 (11%)	1 (5%)	1 (4%)	6 (11%)	1 (4%)
(d) is appropriate reading equipment available on the spot ?							
- Yes	99 (50%)	18 (39%)	14 (74%)	15 (68%)	9 (33%)	31 (54%)	11 (39%)
- No	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -	- -
(e) can prints be supplied from microforms ?							
- on the spot	74 (37%)	9 (20%)	7 (37%)	14 (63%)	7 (26%)	27 (49%)	9 (32%)
- within 2 days	9 (5%)	2 (4%)	4 (21%)	- -	- -	3 (5%)	- -
- after more than 2 days	7 (4%)	3 (7%)	3 (16%)	- -	- -	- -	- -
- not at all	5 (3%)	2 (4%)	- -	1 (5%)	- -	1 (2%)	1 (4%)
18.1. Do acquisitions of official publications (by any means) include unpublished items (e.g. committee reports of the legislature, internal departmental reports or studies) which the issuing source does not publish in the normal course of events to the general public?							

	TOTAL (199)	01 National (46)	02 State (19)	03 Parliamentary (22)	04 Administrative (27)	05 University (57)	06 Public (28)
- Yes	105 (53%)	22 (48%)	13 (68%)	18 (81%)	11 (41%)	31 (54%)	10 (36%)
- No	87 (44%)	23 (50%)	4 (21%)	4 (18%)	13 (48%)	25 (44%)	17 (61%)
18.2. If your answer is Yes:							
What proportion do these constitute of the volume of official publications collected?							
- up to 5%	83 (42%)	13 (28%)	12 (63%)	14 (63%)	8 (30%)	25 (44%)	11 (39%)
- more than 5%	24 (12%)	9 (20%)	1 (5%)	4 (18%)	3 (11%)	7 (12%)	-
19.1. How long after publication do you normally receive :							
(a) official notice of new publications ?							
- within 1 week	42 (21%)	12 (26%)	-	8 (36%)	6 (22%)	10 (18%)	6 (21%)
- within 2-4 weeks	53 (27%)	8 (17%)	2 (11%)	5 (22%)	6 (22%)	24 (42%)	6 (21%)
- within 5-8 weeks	20 (10%)	4 (9%)	5 (26%)	1 (5%)	3 (11%)	4 (7%)	2 (7%)
- within 9-12 weeks	10 (5%)	-	1 (5%)	-	2 (7%)	3 (5%)	4 (14%)
- after more than 12 weeks	25 (13%)	6 (13%)	2 (11%)	2 (9%)	-	8 (14%)	7 (25%)
(b) publications received automatically under deposit arrangements ?							
- within 1 week	39 (20%)	8 (17%)	5 (26%)	12 (54%)	5 (19%)	6 (11%)	2 (7%)
- within 2-4 weeks	67 (34%)	21 (46%)	8 (42%)	9 (40%)	7 (26%)	17 (30%)	5 (18%)
- within 5-8 weeks	27 (14%)	7 (15%)	2 (11%)	2 (9%)	2 (7%)	9 (16%)	4 (14%)
- within 9-12 weeks	11 (6%)	-	1 (5%)	-	1 (4%)	7 (12%)	2 (7%)
- after more than 12 weeks	17 (9%)	7 (15%)	3 (16%)	1 (5%)	-	3 (5%)	3 (11%)
(c) your selections from deposit list (after ordering)							
- within 1 week	11 (6%)	2 (4%)	-	2 (9%)	3 (11%)	2 (4%)	1 (4%)
- within 2-4 weeks	35 (18%)	10 (21%)	4 (21%)	2 (9%)	3 (11%)	7 (12%)	7 (25%)
- within 5-8 weeks	11 (6%)	3 (7%)	2 (11%)	1 (5%)	1 (4%)	4 (7%)	2 (7%)
- within 9-12 weeks	4 (2%)	-	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	-	1 (2%)	-
- after more than 12 weeks	6 (3%)	-	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	2 (7%)	2 (4%)	-

(d) Publications purchased on subscription and standing order ?

- within 1 week
- within 2-4 weeks
- within 5-8 weeks
- within 9-12 weeks
- after more than 12 weeks

(e) publications purchased ad hoc ?

- within 1 week
- within 2-4 weeks
- within 5-8 weeks
- within 9-12 weeks
- after more than 12 weeks

TOTAL (199)	01 National (46)	02 State (19)	03 Parliamentary (22)	04 Administrative (27)	05 University (57)	06 Public (28)
32 (16%)	4 (9%)	-	5 (22%)	5 (19%)	9 (16%)	8 (29%)
63 (32%)	11 (24%)	6 (32%)	3 (13%)	8 (30%)	21 (37%)	12 (43%)
18 (9%)	-	3 (16%)	-	4 (15%)	9 (16%)	2 (7%)
8 (4%)	-	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	1 (4%)	5 (9%)	-
8 (4%)	1 (2%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	-	2 (4%)	3 (11%)
22 (11%)	3 (7%)	-	8 (36%)	6 (22%)	4 (7%)	1 (4%)
65 (33%)	8 (17%)	8 (42%)	3 (13%)	9 (33%)	21 (37%)	16 (59%)
36 (18%)	5 (11%)	-	1 (5%)	3 (11%)	16 (28%)	6 (21%)
10 (5%)	2 (4%)	-	1 (5%)	-	5 (9%)	-
13 (7%)	1 (2%)	-	1 (5%)	-	5 (9%)	4 (14%)

20.1. Not separately analysed.
See Table 7]

	TOTAL (199)	01 National (46)	02 State (19)	03 Parliamentary (22)	04 Administrative (27)	05 University (57)	06 Public (28)
21.1. Are official publications within your jurisdiction issued in more than one language ?							
(a) No	106 (53%)	19 (41%)	11 (58%)	13 (59%)	13 (48%)	28 (49%)	20 (71%)
(b) in 2 languages	46 (23%)	10 (21%)	1 (5%)	3 (13%)	9 (33%)	19 (33%)	4 (14%)
(c) in 3 languages	12 (6%)	5 (11%)	- -	3 (13%)	1 (4%)	1 (2%)	1 (4%)
(d) in more than 3 languages	13 (7%)	6 (13%)	2 (11%)	- -	1 (4%)	3 (5%)	1 (4%)
(e) in bilingual or multilingual editions	43 (22%)	13 (28%)	2 (11%)	3 (13%)	6 (22%)	14 (25%)	4 (14%)
(f) in separate language editions	3 (2%)	17 (37%)	6 (32%)	8 (36%)	8 (30%)	22 (39%)	6 (21%)
21.2. How comprehensively does your library collect language editions where separate ?							
- collects all separate language editions	45 (23%)	20 (43%)	5 (26%)	4 (18%)	5 (19%)	9 (16%)	2 (7%)
- collects language editions selectively	25 (13%)	2 (4%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	4 (15%)	11 (19%)	6 (21%)
- collects in one language only	9 (5%)	1 (2%)	1 (5%)	- -	1 (4%)	4 (7%)	1 (4%)
22.1. Are any of the following significant problems for your library in collecting official publications:							
(a) general							
- identifying official sources	49 (25%)	8 (17%)	7 (37%)	7 (31%)	3 (11%)	16 (28%)	5 (18%)
- tracing publications issued	118 (59%)	32 (70%)	13 (68%)	13 (59%)	11 (41%)	37 (65%)	11 (39%)
(b) inadequate definition of							
- deposit responsibilities	29 (15%)	14 (30%)	5 (26%)	2 (9%)	1 (4%)	7 (12%)	- -

	TOTAL (199)	01 National (46)	02 State (19)	03 Parliamentary (22)	04 Administrative (27)	05 University (57)	06 Public (28)
- depositing bodies	17 (9%)	3 (7%)	6 (32%)	2 (9%)	- -	4 (7%)	2 (7%)
- terms used (e.g. 'published', 'department')	18 (9%)	7 (15%)	5 (26%)	1 (5%)	- -	5 (9%)	- -
- range of publications to be deposited	44 (22%)	10 (21%)	9 (47%)	8 (36%)	1 (4%)	13 (23%)	2 (7%)
(c) failure or weakness							
- in compliance with deposit obligations	63 (32%)	22 (48%)	11 (58%)	10 (45%)	3 (11%)	11 (19%)	14 (50%)
- in administrative arrangements of depositing sources	55 (28%)	15 (33%)	10 (53%)	8 (36%)	5 (19%)	13 (23%)	4 (14%)
(d) purchase:							
- serious delays in supply	28 (14%)	1 (2%)	3 (16%)	4 (18%)	5 (19%)	12 (21%)	2 (7%)
- inadequate prints by issuing sources	36 (18%)	3 (7%)	4 (21%)	5 (22%)	2 (7%)	15 (26%)	5 (18%)
- limitation of funds	30 (15%)	4 (9%)	4 (21%)	1 (5%)	1 (4%)	15 (26%)	4 (14%)
- high prices of official publications	8 (4%)	1 (2%)	- -	- -	1 (4%)	5 (9%)	1 (4%)
- serious postal delays	14 (7%)	- -	2 (11%)	1 (5%)	1 (4%)	6 (11%)	3 (11%)
23.1. By how much has your library's collection of official publications grown in the last complete year for which you can give figures ?	[Data not	separately	analysed.	See comment in report]			
23.2. Are the above figures							
- factual ?	27 (14%)	8 (17%)	3 (16%)	5 (22%)	2 (7%)	5 (9%)	3 (11%)
- estimated ?	57 (29%)	14 (30%)	6 (32%)	8 (36%)	8 (30%)	14 (25%)	6 (21%)

23.3. If you are unable to complete the above, please indicate the reason:

- official publications not shelved separately
- official publications shelved separately but not in measurable form

24.1. Has the annual intake of official publications into your library tended to increase or decrease over the last 3 years ?

(a) increase

- insignificant
- not more than 10% per year
- more than 10% per year

(b) decrease

- insignificant
- not more than 10% per year
- more than 10% per year

24.2. What are the causes of increase or decrease ?

(a) more/less publications issued

- more
- less

(b) more/less issuing sources

- more
- less

(c) more/less effective identification of sources

- more
- less

TOTAL (199)	01 National (46)	02 State (19)	03 Parliamentary (22)	04 Administrative (27)	05 University (57)	06 Public (28)
92 (46%)	26 (57%)	12 (63%)	10 (45%)	12 (44%)	18 (32%)	13 (46%)
54 (27%)	9 (20%)	4 (21%)	5 (22%)	3 (11%)	27 (47%)	6 (21%)
47 (24%)	11 (24%)	3 (16%)	3 (13%)	8 (30%)	14 (25%)	8 (29%)
77 (39%)	16 (35%)	8 (42%)	12 (54%)	8 (30%)	22 (39%)	10 (36%)
47 (24%)	11 (24%)	7 (37%)	5 (22%)	3 (11%)	17 (30%)	3 (11%)
13 (7%)	3 (7%)	-	-	1 (4%)	5 (9%)	4 (14%)
4 (2%)	1 (2%)	-	-	1 (4%)	1 (2%)	1 (4%)
5 (3%)	1 (2%)	-	3 (13%)	-	-	1 (4%)
118 (59%)	23 (50%)	15 (79%)	15 (68%)	14 (52%)	37 (12%)	13 (46%)
8 (4%)	1 (2%)	-	3 (13%)	1 (4%)	2 (4%)	1 (4%)
79 (40%)	17 (37%)	10 (53%)	11 (50%)	5 (19%)	27 (47%)	8 (29%)
5 (3%)	1 (2%)	2 (11%)	1 (5%)	-	1 (2%)	-
52 (26%)	16 (35%)	7 (37%)	5 (22%)	3 (11%)	16 (28%)	4 (14%)
5 (3%)	-	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	-	1 (2%)	1 (4%)

	TOTAL (199)	01 National (46)	02 State (19)	03 Parliamentary (22)	04 Administrative (27)	05 University (57)	06 Public (28)
(d) more/less effective tracing of publications							
- more	58 (29%)	15 (33%)	10 (53%)	5 (22%)	4 (15%)	21 (37%)	2 (7%)
- less	7 (4%)	3 (7%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	- -	- -	2 (7%)
(e) more/less effective deposit arrangements							
- more	41 (21%)	11 (24%)	5 (26%)	6 (27%)	3 (11%)	10 (18%)	6 (21%)
- less	5 (3%)	4 (9%)	- -	1 (5%)	- -	- -	1 (4%)
(f) more/less funds available							
- more	14 (7%)	2 (4%)	- -	2 (9%)	1 (4%)	8 (14%)	1 (4%)
- less	11 (6%)	1 (2%)	2 (11%)	- -	- -	5 (9%)	3 (11%)
(g) more/less effective acquisition procedure							
- more	41 (21%)	7 (15%)	5 (26%)	4 (18%)	2 (7%)	18 (32%)	4 (14%)
- less	3 (2%)	- -	1 (5%)	- -	- -	- -	2 (7%)
(h) change in acquisition policy, causing							
- increase	25 (13%)	1 (2%)	2 (11%)	3 (13%)	3 (11%)	12 (21%)	3 (11%)
- decrease	7 (4%)	- -	- -	- -	2 (7%)	1 (2%)	3 (11%)
24.3. With which main sources of official publications are the increases/decreases associated?							
(a) the legislature							
- increase	64 (32%)	8 (17%)	10 (53%)	12 (54%)	5 (19%)	23 (40%)	5 (18%)
- decrease	4 (2%)	2 (4%)	- -	- -	1 (4%)	- -	1 (4%)
(b) central government							
- increase	114 (57%)	20 (43%)	16 (84%)	12 (54%)	13 (48%)	39 (68%)	13 (46%)
- decrease	12 (6%)	4 (9%)	- -	4 (18%)	1 (4%)	1 (2%)	2 (7%)

	TOTAL (199)	01 National (46)	02 State (19)	03 Parliamentary (22)	04 Administrative (27)	05 University (57)	06 Public (28)
(c) sources in category iv of the Definition at App.A							
- increase	73 (37%)	16 (35%)	9 (47%)	6 (27%)	5 (19%)	25 (44%)	11 (39%)
- decrease	9 (5%)	1 (2%)	1 (5%)	2 (9%)	- -	2 (4%)	3 (11%)
[25.1. Data not separately analysed]							
26.1. Is your library, or official publications collection (if separate) freely accessible							
- to the general public ?	121 (61%)	39 (83%)	15 (79%)	9 (40%)	11 (41%)	29 (51%)	25 (89%)
- only to members of the public who can show a special interest ?	44 (22%)	12 (26%)	1 (5%)	7 (31%)	9 (33%)	12 (21%)	3 (11%)
- to students and researchers of your own institution ?	57 (29%)	10 (21%)	2 (11%)	11 (50%)	10 (37%)	22 (39%)	2 (7%)
- to students and researchers of other institutions ?	49 (25%)	12 (26%)	2 (11%)	2 (9%)	7 (26%)	23 (40%)	2 (7%)
26.2. Does your library give borrowing privileges for official publica- tions							
- to all authorised users ?	74 (37%)	9 (20%)	7 (37%)	9 (40%)	10 (37%)	25 (44%)	11 (39%)
- to limited classes of users ?	71 (36%)	16 (35%)	5 (26%)	11 (49%)	12 (44%)	23 (40%)	3 (11%)
- not at all ?	51 (26%)	22 (48%)	4 (21%)	- -	3 (11%)	1 (2%)	15 (54%)
27.1. Has your library a specific official documents librarian ?							
- Yes	83 (42%)	16 (35%)	12 (63%)	11 (50%)	4 (15%)	33 (58%)	6 (21%)
- No	113 (57%)	30 (65%)	6 (32%)	11 (50%)	21 (78%)	23 (40%)	22 (79%)

	TOTAL (199)	01 National (46)	02 State (19)	03 Parliamentary (22)	04 Administrative (27)	05 University (57)	06 Public (28)
28.1. Is a printed guide available to enquirers about the arrangement and content of the official publications collection, whether integrated or separate ?							
- Yes	61 (31%)	12 (26%)	4 (21%)	5 (22%)	8 (30%)	30 (53%)	2 (7%)
- No	134 (67%)	33 (72%)	14 (74%)	17 (77%)	16 (59%)	26 (46%)	26 (93%)
29.1. If your library's official publications collection is accessible to the general public, how do you make this known ?							
- no special measures	89 (45%)	25 (54%)	11 (58%)	4 (18%)	11 (41%)	20 (35%)	17 (61%)
- notices in library	28 (14%)	8 (17%)	2 (11%)	2 (9%)	2 (7%)	9 (16%)	5 (18%)
- notices in other local libraries	4 (2%)	-	-	-	1 (4%)	3 (5%)	-
- notices in guides to library services	50 (25%)	9 (20%)	4 (21%)	5 (22%)	3 (11%)	21 (37%)	7 (25%)
- advertisement in local media	5 (3%)	2 (4%)	1 (5%)	-	-	2 (4%)	-
30.1. What proportion of official publications is on open shelves (i.e. may be consulted without specific request) ?							
- none	41 (21%)	17 (37%)	5 (26%)	-	4 (15%)	7 (12%)	7 (25%)
- up to 10%	66 (33%)	22 (48%)	7 (37%)	10 (45%)	9 (33%)	7 (12%)	10 (36%)
- 11% - 50%	16 (8%)	2 (4%)	1 (5%)	5 (22%)	-	4 (7%)	4 (14%)
- 51% - 75%	8 (4%)	2 (4%)	2 (11%)	2 (9%)	-	1 (2%)	1 (4%)
- more than 75% but not all	30 (15%)	2 (4%)	-	1 (5%)	6 (22%)	18 (32%)	3 (11%)
- all	32 (16%)	1 (2%)	1 (5%)	3 (13%)	4 (15%)	19 (33%)	3 (11%)
30.2. If less than all, what is the reason for limitation ?							
- space limitations	77 (39%)	15 (33%)	11 (58%)	13 (59%)	10 (37%)	14 (25%)	13 (46%)
- security considerations	91 (46%)	32 (70%)	7 (47%)	9 (40%)	5 (19%)	21 (37%)	15 (54%)

30.3. If less than 50%, what types of publications are on open shelves ?

- reference books (e.g. year-books)
- annual reports
- major political, social, economic reports
- statistical publications
- others

TOTAL (199)	01 National (46)	02 State (19)	03 Parliamentary (22)	04 Administrative (27)	05 University (57)	06 Public (28)
74 (37%)	23 (50%)	7 (37%)	15 (68%)	8 (30%)	10 (18%)	10 (36%)
31 (16%)	6 (13%)	3 (16%)	10 (45%)	4 (15%)	2 (4%)	6 (21%)
34 (17%)	10 (21%)	4 (21%)	8 (36%)	2 (7%)	4 (7%)	6 (21%)
52 (26%)	11 (24%)	6 (32%)	11 (50%)	8 (30%)	6 (11%)	10 (36%)
29 (15%)	6 (13%)	4 (21%)	6 (27%)	2 (7%)	3 (5%)	8 (29%)
30.4. How long does it take library users to obtain official publications not housed on open shelves ?						
- negligible delay	127 (64%)	32 (70%)	11 (58%)	15 (56%)	30 (53%)	23 (82%)
- up to 2 hours	23 (12%)	10 (21%)	3 (16%)	4 (15%)	4 (7%)	-
- 2-4 hours	2 (1%)	1 (2%)	-	1 (4%)	-	-
- more than 4 hours but same day	4 (2%)	-	1 (5%)	-	1 (2%)	-
- more than 1 day	6 (3%)	2 (4%)	1 (5%)	-	1 (2%)	1 (4%)
31.1. How long after receipt by your library are official publications actually available to users ? (average figure)						
- within 1 day	34 (17%)	7 (15%)	4 (21%)	7 (31%)	2 (7%)	9 (16%)
- within 3 days	28 (14%)	5 (11%)	3 (16%)	4 (18%)	5 (19%)	8 (14%)
- within 1 week	33 (17%)	7 (15%)	2 (11%)	3 (13%)	7 (26%)	6 (11%)
- more than 1 week	23 (12%)	5 (11%)	1 (5%)	2 (9%)	4 (15%)	8 (14%)
- more than 2 weeks	77 (39%)	22 (48%)	7 (37%)	6 (27%)	6 (22%)	24 (42%)
31.2. What are the most common causes of delay in availability of current official publications to users of your library?						
- delays in receipt by library after publication	109 (55%)	21 (46%)	13 (68%)	12 (54%)	11 (41%)	38 (67%)

	TOTAL (199)	01 National (46)	02 State (19)	03 Parliamentary (22)	04 Administrative (27)	05 University (57)	06 Public (28)
- delays in internal processes (e.g. cataloguing)	124 (62%)	33 (72%)	13 (68%)	12 (54%)	16 (59%)	33 (58%)	16 (57%)
- internal access procedures for publications not on open shelves	11 (6%)	4 (9%)	2 (11%)	- -	1 (4%)	2 (4%)	1 (4%)
32.1. Do you weed official publica- tions, and if so after how long and which type of material ?							
- collections not weeded	150 (75%)	39 (85%)	14 (74%)	17 (77%)	16 (59%)	41 (72%)	22 (79%)
- weeded after 1 year	6 (3%)	- -	- -	3 (13%)	1 (4%)	1 (2%)	1 (4%)
- weeded after 2 years	7 (4%)	- -	- -	1 (5%)	1 (4%)	4 (7%)	1 (4%)
- weeded after 3 years	3 (2%)	1 (2%)	- -	- -	- -	2 (4%)	- -
- weeded after more than 3 years	20 (10%)	2 (4%)	2 (11%)	- -	6 (22%)	7 (12%)	3 (11%)
33.1. How effective are interlending arrangements in terms of :							
(a) satisfaction of your requests ?							
- less than 50% of requests met	12 (6%)	1 (2%)	- -	- -	2 (7%)	5 (9%)	4 (14%)
- more than 50% of requests met	88 (44%)	21 (46%)	13 (68%)	8 (36%)	16 (59%)	23 (40%)	6 (21%)
(b) average time taken to meet your requests ?							
- within 1 week	41 (21%)	7 (15%)	4 (21%)	5 (22%)	15 (56%)	7 (12%)	3 (11%)
- within 2 weeks	32 (16%)	9 (20%)	4 (21%)	1 (5%)	2 (7%)	12 (21%)	3 (11%)
- more than 2 weeks	28 (14%)	6 (13%)	5 (26%)	2 (9%)	1 (4%)	9 (16%)	5 (18%)
33.2. How long does your library take to identify and despatch an official publication inter- lent ?							
- 1 day	32 (16%)	6 (13%)	3 (16%)	4 (18%)	8 (30%)	10 (18%)	1 (4%)
- 2-3 days	59 (30%)	11 (24%)	8 (42%)	4 (18%)	9 (33%)	19 (33%)	8 (29%)
- more than 3 days	24 (12%)	5 (11%)	3 (16%)	2 (9%)	3 (11%)	7 (12%)	3 (11%)

33.3. What are the main causes of difficulty and delay in inter-lending ?

- difficulty in identification
- incomplete knowledge of interlending collections

- handling time
- postal time

34.1. Is your library's official publications collection separate or integrated ?

- wholly separate
- partly separate
- wholly integrated

34.2. How do you indicate this to users ?

- no special indication
- notices displayed in library
- notices in catalogues/indexes

35.1. How are official publications incorporated in your main library catalogue ?

(a) not at all

(b) selectively by class

- by subject
- by title
- by author/issuing source

TOTAL (199)	01 National (46)	02 State (19)	03 Parliamentary (22)	04 Administrative (27)	05 University (57)	06 Public (28)
43 (22%)	6 (13%)	5 (26%)	7 (31%)	4 (15%)	19 (33%)	2 (7%)
16 (8%)	1 (2%)	3 (16%)	- -	1 (4%)	9 (16%)	2 (7%)
44 (22%)	10 (21%)	7 (37%)	2 (9%)	7 (26%)	11 (19%)	6 (21%)
40 (20%)	8 (17%)	4 (21%)	3 (13%)	5 (19%)	14 (25%)	6 (21%)
45 (23%)	8 (17%)	6 (32%)	8 (36%)	3 (11%)	16 (28%)	4 (14%)
67 (34%)	13 (28%)	3 (16%)	6 (27%)	8 (30%)	24 (42%)	12 (43%)
84 (42%)	25 (54%)	9 (47%)	8 (36%)	14 (52%)	15 (26%)	12 (43%)
91 (46%)	17 (37%)	10 (53%)	13 (59%)	17 (63%)	16 (28%)	18 (64%)
46 (23%)	8 (17%)	5 (26%)	2 (9%)	4 (15%)	22 (39%)	4 (14%)
77 (39%)	21 (46%)	4 (21%)	7 (31%)	4 (15%)	33 (59%)	7 (25%)
17 (9%)	3 (7%)	3 (16%)	2 (9%)	2 (7%)	5 (9%)	2 (7%)
21 (11%)	6 (13%)	1 (5%)	- -	4 (15%)	8 (14%)	2 (7%)
15 (8%)	2 (4%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	4 (15%)	6 (11%)	1 (4%)
17 (9%)	4 (9%)	- -	- -	3 (11%)	8 (14%)	2 (7%)

	TOTAL (199)	01 National (46)	02 State (19)	03 Parliamentary (22)	04 Administrative (27)	05 University (57)	06 Public (28)
(c) selectively by item							
- by subject	28 (14%)	1 (2%)	4 (21%)	4 (18%)	2 (7%)	10 (18%)	7 (25%)
- by title	27 (14%)	2 (4%)	3 (16%)	4 (18%)	1 (4%)	10 (18%)	7 (25%)
- by author/issuing source	35 (18%)	3 (7%)	4 (21%)	4 (18%)	2 (7%)	14 (25%)	8 (29%)
(d) complete coverage							
- by subject	88 (44%)	24 (52%)	9 (47%)	8 (36%)	12 (44%)	22 (39%)	11 (39%)
- by title	89 (45%)	27 (59%)	8 (42%)	6 (27%)	10 (37%)	26 (46%)	10 (36%)
- by author/issuing source	111 (56%)	34 (73%)	10 (53%)	11 (50%)	15 (56%)	30 (53%)	9 (32%)
35.2. Do you have a separate official publications catalogue ?							
(a) No	118 (59%)	27 (59%)	10 (53%)	12 (54%)	19 (70%)	29 (51%)	19 (68%)
(b) Yes	66 (33%)	14 (30%)	8 (42%)	8 (36%)	5 (19%)	26 (46%)	5 (18%)
- by subject	25 (13%)	5 (11%)	4 (21%)	6 (27%)	1 (4%)	6 (11%)	3 (11%)
- by title	27 (14%)	5 (11%)	3 (16%)	5 (22%)	3 (11%)	11 (19%)	-
- by author/issuing source	54 (27%)	11 (24%)	6 (32%)	7 (31%)	3 (11%)	24 (42%)	3 (11%)
- by class	9 (5%)	4 (9%)	2 (11%)	-	1 (4%)	2 (4%)	-
35.3. Do you use lists, catalogues and indexes of issuing sources:							
(a) as sole means of identifying and finding official publications ?							
- Yes	38 (19%)	12 (26%)	2 (11%)	1 (5%)	5 (19%)	11 (19%)	7 (25%)
- No	101 (51%)	25 (54%)	10 (53%)	11 (50%)	10 (37%)	30 (53%)	15 (54%)
(b) to identify titles before searching library catalogues ?							
- Yes	78 (39%)	14 (30%)	7 (37%)	6 (27%)	7 (26%)	31 (54%)	12 (43%)
- No	53 (27%)	17 (37%)	7 (37%)	5 (22%)	5 (19%)	13 (23%)	6 (21%)
(c) annotated as finding aids?							
- Yes	59 (30%)	12 (26%)	3 (16%)	4 (18%)	6 (22%)	22 (39%)	10 (36%)
- No	65 (33%)	16 (35%)	8 (42%)	7 (31%)	7 (26%)	19 (33%)	8 (29%)

	TOTAL (199)	01 National (46)	02 State (19)	03 Parliamentary (22)	04 Administrative (27)	05 University (57)	06 Public (28)
35.4. If there are any relevant to your jurisdiction, how far do you use commercially-produced catalogues/indexes to official publications ?							
- heavily used in preference to official lists and catalogues	6 (3%)	1 (2%)	- -	- -	1 (4%)	4 (7%)	- -
- used to supplement official lists and catalogues	66 (33%)	15 (33%)	4 (21%)	2 (9%)	6 (22%)	26 (46%)	11 (39%)
- not used/little used: official material preferred	46 (23%)	10 (21%)	7 (37%)	4 (18%)	9 (33%)	9 (16%)	7 (25%)
36.1. Do you cross-reference official publications entered in your main library catalogue?							
- Yes	67 (34%)	18 (39%)	6 (32%)	5 (22%)	9 (33%)	23 (40%)	5 (18%)
- No	97 (49%)	21 (46%)	10 (53%)	9 (40%)	11 (41%)	26 (46%)	17 (61%)
36.2. If yes, how ?							
(a) from main library catalogue by:							
- general cross-references by class	17 (9%)	4 (9%)	2 (11%)	2 (9%)	1 (4%)	7 (12%)	- -
- specific cross-references by subject	29 (15%)	9 (20%)	3 (16%)	2 (9%)	6 (22%)	7 (12%)	1 (4%)
- specific cross-references by author/issuing source	49 (25%)	15 (33%)	4 (21%)	2 (9%)	7 (26%)	16 (28%)	4 (14%)
- specific cross-references by title	27 (14%)	5 (11%)	4 (21%)	1 (5%)	6 (22%)	7 (12%)	3 (11%)
(b) to :							
- separate official publications catalogue	19 (10%)	6 (13%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	- -	10 (18%)	1 (4%)
- lists and catalogues of issuing sources	4 (2%)	1 (2%)	1 (5%)	- -	1 (4%)	1 (2%)	- -
- commercially produced lists & catalogues	1 (1%)	- -	- -	- -	- -	1 (2%)	- -
- enquiry point	11 (6%)	4 (9%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	1 (4%)	3 (5%)	1 (4%)

	TOTAL (107)	01 National (46)	02 State (19)	03 Parliamentary (22)	04 Administrative (27)	05 University (57)	06 Public (28)
37.1. Do you consider your library's cataloguing and referencing of official publications adequate for the needs of users ?							
- Yes	135 (68%)	34 (74%)	12 (63%)	18 (81%)	18 (67%)	35 (61%)	17 (61%)
- No	54 (27%)	10 (21%)	6 (32%)	3 (13%)	5 (19%)	20 (35%)	9 (32%)
37.2. If no, do you have plans to improve it ?							
- Yes, within 3 years	26 (13%)	6 (12%)	3 (16%)	1 (5%)	3 (11%)	10 (18%)	3 (11%)
- Yes, within 5 years	16 (8%)	3 (7%)	3 (16%)	1 (5%)	1 (4%)	5 (9%)	3 (11%)
- No	18 (9%)	2 (4%)	-	1 (5%)	3 (11%)	8 (14%)	3 (11%)
38.1. Do you record the amount of use which your official publications collection receives by consultation and/or borrowing ?							
- not at all	114 (57%)	21 (46%)	10 (53%)	17 (77%)	18 (67%)	27 (47%)	20 (71%)
- records of borrowing	43 (22%)	9 (20%)	6 (32%)	3 (13%)	7 (26%)	15 (26%)	2 (7%)
- records of requests for titles not on open shelves	25 (13%)	12 (26%)	2 (11%)	-	4 (15%)	5 (9%)	2 (7%)
- interlending records	31 (16%)	10 (21%)	4 (21%)	2 (9%)	5 (19%)	7 (12%)	3 (11%)
- number of visitors to collection	40 (20%)	15 (33%)	4 (21%)	1 (5%)	5 (19%)	11 (19%)	4 (14%)
39.1. Do you record the types/ purposes of users of your official publications collection ?							
- not at all	146 (73%)	30 (65%)	13 (68%)	17 (77%)	21 (78%)	41 (72%)	23 (82%)
- use by general public	28 (14%)	11 (24%)	5 (26%)	2 (9%)	3 (11%)	3 (5%)	3 (11%)
- academic and professional users	33 (17%)	12 (26%)	3 (16%)	-	3 (11%)	12 (21%)	3 (11%)
- business and government users	22 (11%)	8 (17%)	4 (21%)	1 (5%)	4 (15%)	4 (7%)	1 (4%)
40.1. [Not separately analysed.]	See	Appendix A]					
41.1. Not separately analysed.	See	Appendix A]					

	TOTAL (199)	01 National (46)	02 State (19)	03 Parliamentary (22)	04 Administrative (27)	05 University (57)	06 Public (28)
42.1. Does your library collect publications of local authorities ?							
- No	43 (22%)	4 (9%)	5 (26%)	6 (27%)	10 (37%)	17 (30%)	1 (4%)
- Yes	143 (72%)	37 (80%)	13 (68%)	14 (64%)	15 (56%)	37 (65%)	25 (89%)
- within own jurisdiction	53 (27%)	9 (20%)	8 (42%)	4 (18%)	2 (7%)	13 (23%)	16 (57%)
- on a wider scale within the country	69 (35%)	21 (46%)	5 (26%)	5 (22%)	8 (30%)	19 (33%)	9 (32%)
42.2. How many tiers or kinds of local authorities have significant publishing output within your jurisdiction ?							
- less than 4	67 (34%)	16 (35%)	6 (32%)	8 (36%)	4 (15%)	21 (37%)	11 (39%)
- 4 or more	64 (32%)	16 (35%)	6 (32%)	6 (27%)	7 (26%)	16 (28%)	13 (46%)
42.3. How does your library trace publications of local authorities ?							
- from published lists	63 (32%)	13 (28%)	4 (21%)	6 (27%)	9 (33%)	20 (35%)	10 (36%)
- from unpublished lists	20 (10%)	4 (9%)	1 (5%)	1 (5%)	3 (11%)	4 (7%)	7 (25%)
- by other means	103 (52%)	25 (54%)	10 (53%)	10 (45%)	10 (37%)	27 (48%)	20 (71%)
42.4. What are the major problems in collecting publications of local authorities ?							
- difficulties of tracing	111 (56%)	31 (67%)	12 (63%)	13 (59%)	10 (37%)	28 (49%)	16 (57%)
- difficulties in obtaining when traced	56 (28%)	9 (20%)	5 (26%)	8 (36%)	4 (15%)	20 (35%)	10 (36%)
- others	13 (7%)	3 (7%)	-	3 (13%)	-	3 (5%)	4 (14%)
42.5. Does your library include publications of local authorities in official publications collections which are separately shelved?							
- Yes	55 (28%)	13 (28%)	4 (21%)	3 (13%)	2 (7%)	21 (37%)	11 (39%)
- No	68 (34%)	18 (39%)	6 (32%)	10 (45%)	10 (37%)	12 (21%)	12 (43%)

	TOTAL (199)	01 National (46)	02 State (19)	03 Parliamentary (22)	04 Administrative (27)	05 University (57)	06 Public (28)
43.1. Does your library collect publications of intergovernmental international organisations ?							
- No	17 (9%)	3 (7%)	6 (32%)	1 (5%)	4 (15%)	- -	3 (11%)
- Yes	154 (77%)	37 (80%)	11 (58%)	17 (77%)	18 (67%)	48 (84%)	21 (75%)
- from organisations based with- in own jurisdiction or country	35 (18%)	10 (21%)	5 (26%)	3 (13%)	3 (11%)	6 (11%)	8 (29%)
- on a wider scale	122 (61%)	24 (52%)	8 (42%)	14 (63%)	15 (56%)	45 (79%)	14 (50%)
43.2. Are such publications collect- ed :							
(a) as deposits received from particular organisa- tions ?	88 (44%)	30 (65%)	6 (32%)	8 (36%)	7 (26%)	29 (51%)	8 (29%)
(b) as a result of collect- ing policy ;							
- for coverage of specific organisations or groups (e.g. the U.N. family)?	99 (50%)	21 (46%)	9 (47%)	9 (40%)	9 (33%)	37 (65%)	14 (50%)
- for subject coverage ?	67 (34%)	9 (20%)	6 (32%)	9 (40%)	10 (37%)	22 (39%)	10 (36%)
- for regional collections?	31 (16%)	7 (15%)	3 (16%)	2 (9%)	4 (15%)	10 (18%)	5 (18%)
43.3. Does your library							
- maintain a special collec- tion of intergovernmental organisations publications?	43 (22%)	13 (28%)	3 (16%)	8 (36%)	2 (7%)	15 (26%)	1 (4%)
- integrate them with a special collection of official publications ?	46 (23%)	8 (17%)	4 (21%)	5 (22%)	3 (11%)	21 (37%)	5 (18%)
- integrate them with the main library collections ?	92 (46%)	21 (46%)	8 (42%)	7 (31%)	13 (48%)	25 (44%)	16 (57%)

[43.4. Not separately analysed. See comment in report]

43.5. What are the main difficulties in tracing and acquiring the publications of international organisations ?

- inadequacy of published indexes and catalogues	58 (29%)	10 (21%)	7 (37%)	6 (27%)	4 (15%)	23 (40%)	7 (25%)
- difficulty in obtaining published lists and catalogues	56 (28%)	13 (28%)	5 (26%)	6 (27%)	6 (22%)	20 (35%)	5 (18%)
- lack of local agencies for ordering and purchase	37 (19%)	9 (20%)	4 (21%)	4 (18%)	1 (4%)	14 (25%)	4 (14%)
- difficulties with direct ordering from the organisations themselves	56 (28%)	11 (24%)	5 (26%)	6 (27%)	8 (30%)	21 (37%)	5 (18%)

43.6. Are collections of international organisations' publications

- specially catalogued or indexed ?	20 (10%)	5 (11%)	2 (11%)	5 (22%)	1 (4%)	6 (11%)	1 (4%)
- catalogued or indexed in the same way as other official publications ?	102 (51%)	23 (50%)	9 (47%)	9 (40%)	14 (52%)	28 (49%)	14 (50%)
- available to users on the same basis as other official publications ?	117 (59%)	27 (59%)	11 (58%)	9 (40%)	14 (52%)	38 (67%)	16 (57%)

43.7. Does your library use information retrieval systems of inter-governmental agencies (e.g. AGRIS, ISIS)?

- No	136 (68%)	34 (74%)	13 (68%)	15 (68%)	17 (63%)	38 (67%)	18 (64%)
- Yes	16 (8%)	3 (7%)	1 (5%)	-	2 (7%)	8 (14%)	2 (7%)

DISTRIBUTION OF QUESTIONNAIRE AND RESPONSE

	INITIAL DISTRIBUTION				RESPONSE
	ENGLISH	FRENCH	SPANISH	RUSSIAN	
Australia	21				18
Austria	1				1
Bangladesh	3				1
Barbados	3				3
Botswana	3				1
Brazil			12		3
Bulgaria				6	1
Cameroon (United Republic of)		2			-
Canada	27				22
Chile			4		1
China	10				-
Colombia			7		-
Costa Rica			5		1
Cuba			6		2
Czechoslovakia				11	3
Denmark	1				1
Egypt		12			-
Ethiopia		4			-
Fiji	3				1
France		16			14
German Democratic Republic	8				1
Germany (Federal Republic of)	12				8
Ghana	8				1
Greece		7			1
Guyana	4				1
Hungary		9			4
India	17				1
Indonesia	5				1
Iran	8				1
Ireland	8				6
Israel	6				3
Italy		14			4
Ivory Coast		4			1
Jamaica	3				2
Japan	14				7
Jordan	5				-
Kenya	8				2

	INITIAL DISTRIBUTION				RESPONSE
	ENGLISH	FRENCH	SPANISH	RUSSIAN	
Kuwait	2				-
Madagascar		5			-
Malaysia	8				4
Mexico			12		2
Morocco		5			2
Mozambique			2		-
Netherlands	9				1
Nigeria	14				7
Pakistan	8				1
Philippines	3				-
Poland		7			3
Romania				4	-
Saudi Arabia		5			-
Senegal		3			1
Singapore	3				2
Spain			8		6
Sri Lanka	6				-
Sweden	7				6
Tanzania	4				1
Tunisia		2			1
Turkey		6			1
U.S.S.R.				25	-
United Kingdom	14				13
United States of America	30				19
Venezuela			10		2
Zaire		3			1
Zambia	3				3
TOTAL = 505	289	104	66	46	
SUPPLEMENTARY DISTRIBUTION					
Argentina			7		-
Belgium		8			1
Ecuador			10		3
Lesotho	1				-
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		5			-
Malawi	3				1

	INITIAL DISTRIBUTION				RESPONSE
	ENGLISH	FRENCH	SPANISH	RUSSIAN	
Mauritius		5			2
New Zealand	6				2
Sierra Leone	2				1
Sudan	4				-
Yugoslavia		9			-
TOTAL = 565	305	131	83	46	205

Notes: 1. 121 Questionnaires were distributed to countries from which no response was received.

2. Completed questionnaires were received from Austria and from Denmark, which were not included in the distributions.